

4824 l. 1.
~~2008~~

17 AP 57



A
LIBRARY
of
ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORS.

J. Gwyn, sculp.

A NEW
HISTORY

OF

Ecclesiastical Writers:

Containing an ACCOUNT

Of the *Authors* of the several Books of
the OLD and NEW TESTAMENT;

Of the *LIVES* and *WRITINGS* of the

PRIMITIVE FATHERS;

An Abridgment and Catalogue of their WORKS;

Their Various Editions, and Censures Determining the
GENUINE and SPURIOUS.

Together with a

Judgment upon their *Stile* and *Doctrine*.

A L S O,

A Compendious History of the COUNCILS;
With Chronological TABLES of the whole.

Written in *FRENCH*.

By *Lewis Ellies du PIN*, Doctor of the *SORBON*, and *Regius*
Professor of Divinity at *Paris*.

VOLUME the SECOND;

Containing the AUTHORS that flourished in the Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth AGES of the CHURCH.

THE THIRD EDITION, CORRECTED.

DUBLIN:

Printed by and for *GEORGE GRIERSON*, at the Two Bibles in
Essex-Street, MDCCXXIV.

T H E P R E F A C E T O T H E R E A D E R.

IT may not be improper to acquaint the Reader with a short Character of the following Centuries, the History of which the learned and judicious M. *Du Pin* hath handled with so much Justness and Impartiality, notwithstanding the Discouragements he has met with from the Heads of his own Church, for his free and ingenuous Account of the preceding ones.

Altho' the Authors of the seventh and eighth Centuries are not to be compared with those of the former, yet some flourished in them that are not to be despised; 'tis true the greatest part of them were only Compilers or Imitators: Yet we may still find among them some Remains of Learning, Judgment, good Taste, and even Eloquence. It was in this Age they began to reduce the Arts and Sciences to a Method, and to digest the Doctrines of Religion into Systems. It was then that the first Treatises on all the Points of Divinity appeared. The Discipline of the Church which was much relaxed by the Irregularities of the greater part of Christians, and chiefly of the Ecclesiasticks, was supported by several good Canons of the Councils. The Church of *Spain* made a great Number in the seventh Century, and that of *France* in the eighth; but the People payed so little regard to them, that they were obliged to use the Authority of the Princes Edicts to get them executed. The Church of *England* produced several great Men and good Laws: The *Grecian* Eloquence degenerated very much from its former Splendor; their Sermons were for the most part only Declamations, full of Fustian and Trifles; and their dogmatical Compositions were very dry and barren; the *Spiritual Meadow* shews how fond Men were at that time of Fables, and the *Acts* of the Council of *Nice*, how ignorant they were in Criticism. The *Penitentials*, which seem'd to be design'd for the Preservation of the Discipline of *Penance*, corrupted its Purity, and destroy'd its ancient Severity; as likewise the casuistical Books which ought to have secured Morality, became the Causes of its Corruption: Publick Penances grew very uncommon, and private ones more frequent: Auricular Confessions, of all sorts of Sins, was then much in use. Priests said Mass every Day. The Communion was received in both Kinds, but the Bread they offer'd, was less than in former times. The Rites and Ceremonies of the *Roman* Church were introduced into most of the Western Churches, but particularly those of *France*. The Popes became very powerful in their temporal Sovereignty, by the Donations of *Pepin* and his Successors. Great Ignorance and Licentiousness reigned among the Bishops and the rest of the Clergy; and the Princes labour'd exceedingly to reform them. Some Bishops willing to reform their inferior Clergy, were obliged to make them live in Cloysters like the Monks; it is from this the Order of Canon Regulars took their Rise, which *Chrodegand* Bishop of *Mets* seems to have instituted. In short, there was much Superstition, and little solid Piety in this Age; as witness the Adoration of Images, which was now first broached: And here we cannot enough admire, with what Justness and Fidelity our excellent Author relates the Disputes which were carried on in the second Council of *Nice*, on that Subject. And this Piece of History alone is sufficient to let any rational Man see, how late that idolatrous Innovation was introduced into the Church, and how little the primitive Christians even dreamt of it.

The Ninth Century was perplexed with so many intricate *Controversies* quite through it, that scarce any Person, but one of Mr. *du Pin*'s great Abilities, and firm Judgment, would have dared to meddle with it; yet he hath done it with that Clearness, Integrity, and Faithfulness, that it is render'd one of the most profitable Parts of *Church-History*. Indeed, the Roughness of the Way hath forced him out of his former Method, and this Part of his History appears in a different Dress from his former; yet the same Ingenuity, Learning, and Freedom, is so visible throughout, that no Man that hath any thing of the *Critick*, can doubt it to be his; and, the different Method hath made the *Controversies* of the Age so clear, that that History, which in our *Annals* seems very confused, is, by his Way of Management, rendered not only clear and intelligible; but extremely pleasant and delightful, serving to give Light to some of the greatest Contests, which have disturbed the Church in these *Latter Ages*; particularly those of *Predestination*, and *Grace*, *Christ's Real Presence in the Sacrament*, &c. Some of the *Controversies* being such, as are at this Day hotly debated, between the Church of *Rome* and the *Protestants*: It may be justly suspected, that our Author should represent Things most fairly for the *Romish* Side, in which, by his Profession, he is engaged, few being impartial in such Cases; but, to the just Commendation of Mr. *Du Pin*'s Integrity, it ought to be said, that he hath even in those Points, no farther inclined to his own Side, than the Zeal of the contending Parties hath justly obliged him, and the Words of the *Controversists* will fairly bear, which is confess'd, are sometimes through the Heat of Contention, and *αυτοεπίδωσαν*, very extravagant; but that ought to be imputed to the Author he is speaking of, not Mr. *du Pin*: So that considering the Temptation our Author had to be partial in the History of this Century, more than in any of the former, he is more to be admired for his Impartiality and Integrity in this, than in the *Former Volumes*.

The greatest Part of the Historians, who have deliver'd their Opinions concerning the Character of the Tenth Century, have represented it as an Age of Darkness, Ignorance and Obscurity, accompanied with notorious Disorders and Irregularities. The Author of a Treatise, call'd, *The Perpetuity of the Faith*, has undertaken to vindicate

ate it from these Censures, and to make it appear on the contrary, *That it is one of the most happy Ages of the Church, and that its Disorders being only such as were common to the Preceding, it has some very remarkable* *Advantages* : But a third Writer, who would seem to keep the middle Way between both these Extremes, appears (in my Opinion) to have come nearer to the Mark. For if on the one Side, the Author of the *Perpetuity* has well observ'd, that there were Holy Men, and some clear-sighted Persons in that Century; it cannot be denied on the other side, That Ignorance, Vices and Irregularities were generally very predominant. The inconsiderable Number of Authors, who wrote; the few Works they left; the Rudeness and Barbarism of their Stile; the Matters contained in their Dissertations; and the Complaints that even those Writers themselves make, of the Disorders which prevailed in their Time; are evident Proofs, That the Censures pass'd upon that Century, are not without sufficient Ground : And if a due Comparison be made, between the Writers, the Works, the Subjects treated of, the Constitutions of Councils, the Church-Discipline, and the Manners of the Christians of the same Age, with those of the preceding; it cannot but be readily acknowledg'd, that it is in many Respects inferior to them.

'Tis true indeed, that there were Irregularities in all the Ages of the Church, but that they were Commensurate to those which were so common in the Tenth Century; or that they were spread abroad so far, or become so general, is an Assertion, which cannot be maintained with any Manner of Probability : For who can avouch with Assurance, That that Age had as great a share in Learning and Eloquence; was as fruitful in illustrious Personages and Ecclesiastical Writers; or was as productive of excellent Works and regular Constitutions as the preceding Centuries? Who would adventure to compare the Popes *John IX, X, XII, and XIII.* and the other Bishops of *Rome*, who lived in the Tenth Century, I will not say, to *S. Leo*, or *S. Gregory*, but even to those Popes, who were less eminent in former Times? Or who would attempt to set up *Ratherius, Atto, Flodoard, Luitprand, Metaphrastes*, and other Ecclesiastical Writers, whose Number is very small, not to say in Opposition to *S. Athanasius, S. Basil, S. Ambrose, S. Augustin, Eusebius, and Theodoret*; but even to the more common Authors of the preceding Ages? Upon the Whole, it ought to be certainly determin'd, That 'tis not without good Reason, that that Century, in Comparison of the foregoing, and even of those that follow it, has been generally stil'd, *The Age of Darknes, Ignorance, and Obscurity*. However it must be acknowledged, That 'twas not altogether dark, and that it brought forth some Lights, which penetrated the Darknels, and dispers'd Part of the Obscurity. The most ingenious *M. Du Pin* followed these Luminaries, and took them for his Guides, in writing the Ecclesiastical History of the Age in which they flourished, and in giving an impartial Account of the Matters treated of by them; which he has done with that Clearness, Generosity and Integrity, which is so inseparable from the Character of this great Man.

The
Eleventh
Century.
In the Eleventh Century, different Opinions arose concerning the holy Sacraments; the *Latin* and *Greek* Churches came to an open Rupture; the Popes took upon them to depose Emperors and Kings; and scholastick Divinity, the Source of an infinite Number of Questions, took then its first Rise. The Minds of Men being recovered, as it were, from that Lethargy, wherewith they were seiz'd in the preceding Age; they began to apply themselves to Study, in the beginning of this: Insomuch that in a short Space of Time, all *Europe* was fill'd with judicious and learned Personages, who communicated their Knowledge to others, either by Publick Lectures or Writings.

The Controversies, that afterwards arose, were likewise a powerful Motive to excite them to Study; and gave Occasion to those, who were endow'd with extraordinary Parts, to exercise their Pens, and to shew their Learning. Some were very successful in imitating the Ancients, both in their Style and Manner of Writing; but the greatest Part of them still retain'd somewhat of the Barbarism and Coarseness of the former Age, and others fell into that uncouth and barren Method of handling Matters, which is more especially peculiar to Logicians. The most notorious Disorders were regulated; enormous Crimes were restrain'd; and the Bishops took a great deal of Pains in reforming Church-Discipline; which nevertheless, was not restor'd to its ancient Perfection. Thus much may serve to give a general Idea of the Eleventh Century, which the learned *M. DU PIN* (according to his usual Method) has improved to the best Advantage.

The
Twelfth
Century.
The Twelfth Century contains a greater Number of Authors than the Ages before it, some whereof may be compared to the greatest Lights of the Church. We here find the Empire and the Church at Difference; The Church of *Rome* disturb'd by obstinate Schisms; The Popes at War with the Emperors; The Kings and Bishops in Dispute about their Rights. The Dignity of the Sacraments, and the external Worship in Religion, as also its Principles are attack'd by monstrous and ridiculous Heresies. Scholastick Divinity becomes the common Study, and the Body of the Canon-Law, such as it is at present, was form'd and established in this Twelfth Century. The Church is stock'd with abundance of Monastick and Regular Orders. The Immunities and Exemptions of the Revenues of the Church and Ecclesiastical Persons are vigorously supported by the Bishops, and maintained by the Decrees of Councils. And finally, the Manners of Ecclesiasticks and the external Ceremonies of the Church are reformed in this Age by several very useful Regulations. This is what the Reader will find in the History and Extracts of the Authors and Councils of this Twelfth Century.

The
Thirteenth
Century.
The Thirteenth Century was covered with some Remains of that Ignorance and Barbarism, which reigned in the last preceding Ages: But this is so far from being any just Prejudice against this History, that it should rather invite the Ingenious Reader's Curiosity, when he considers, that the excellent Historian has enlightned these dark Ages, by giving a clearer Account of them than any one Writer before him; for he has brought to light some notable Pieces of History which seem'd to be buried in Oblivion, and collected together the several Fragments which were scatter'd in many Volumes, and plac'd them in such a clear light, that the Darknes of the Times serves to set off and commend the Judgment of the Historian. It is his peculiar Excellency, that he gives a just Idea of the most considerable Ecclesiastical Writers in all the Ages of the Church; not by general Characters, but by giving an account of the Matters handled in their Works, and taking judicious Extracts out of them; and particularly, he has added to the History of each Century such useful Observations, as give the Reader a general Idea of the great Transactions then on foot: So that nothing seems to be wanting to render the Translation of this Century compleat, but some Remarks which may be of use to the Protestant Reader, of which I shall therefore present him with a few, relating to the Controversies between the *Roman* Church and the Church of *England*.

It has been observed by Monsieur *Du Pin* and others, That School-Divinity was corrupted in the 13th Century, by introducing into it the Principles of *Aristotle's* Philosophy, whereby all Matters of Doctrine were resolv'd into a great many curious and useless Questions, and decided by the Maxims of that Philosophy (which yet was learned not from the *Greek* Originals, but the corrupt Versions of the *Arabians*) as if they were of equal Authority with the Scriptures: And as this mixture corrupted the Simplicity of the ancient Christian Faith, so it was the cause of many Mischiefs, among which I reckon this to be none of the least, that it furnish'd Men with such Principles as were subservient to maintain the Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which begun in this Century to be established. As for Instance, this Philosophy taught Men, that Quantity is an Accident distinct and separable from Body, from whence they inferr'd the Possibility of the Replication and Penetration of Bodies, and maintain'd, as the School-men do to this Day, that the same Body may be in a thousand distant Places at the same time; that the
same

same Man may be alive at *London* and kill'd at *Rome*; that the whole Body of a lusty Man, with all its several Parts, may be crouded within the Compass of a Pins head, by which Doctrines they defended some of these Absurdities, which are implied in Transubstantiation, viz. That the Body of Christ is at the same time in Heaven and Earth, and in all the several Places where the Eucharist is celebrated, that it is whole in the whole Loaf, and whole in every the least part of it, and many other such like Absurdities, which are real Contradictions to the Nature of a Body, if Extension is essential to it, as it is held to be by the best Philosophers both Ancient and Modern.

The first pretended General Council in which Transubstantiation is said to be established, was the fourth *Lateran* Council under *Innocent III.* in the Year 1215. But *Du Pin* has plainly prov'd, that the Canons which go under the Name of this Council, were not made by the Council it self, but only by Pope *Innocent III.* who read some of them in the Council, and after its Dissolution added many more as he pleas'd, *Dissert. 7. de Antiq. Eccl. Discipl. Ch. 3. Sect. 4.* which is a Trick that the Popes had commonly used in the 12th Century, who publish'd their own Constitutions as the Decrees of Councils, *Du Pin Hist. Eccl. 12th. Cent. P. 217*

I shall not pretend to give an Account what was the Doctrine of the first Eight Ages of the Church concerning the Eucharist, which may be learned from Archbishop *Usher*, Bishop *Cosins*, and others. But to me it seems an Invincible Argument, that Transubstantiation was not then believed, that the Jews and Heathens did not charge the Christians with the Absurdities and Contradictions, which are the obvious and natural Consequences of that Doctrine.

As to the Term of Transubstantiation, *Du Pin* says it was first used by *Celles* Bishop of *Chartres*, and *Stephen* Bishop of *Aulun*, in the 12th. Century, p. 355. As to the Doctrine it self, it appears to have been first published by *Paschasius* in his Treatise of the Body and Blood of our Saviour about the Year 832. wherein he asserts, That after the Consecration under the Figure of Bread and Wine there is nothing but the Body and Blood of Christ; and which is yet more wonderful, he adds, *It is no other Flesh than that which was born of Mary, suffered on the Cross, and rose again from the Grave.* He might very well call it wonderful Doctrine, not only for its apparent Absurdity, but for its Novelty (since the like Expressions had never been used before) which is ingenuously confess'd by *Bellarmin.* de Scriptor. Eccl. ad annum 850. and by *Sirmondus* in the Life of *Paschasius* prefixed to his Works, Par. 1618. and may be plainly proved from the Writings of the most learned Men in this Century. For, first, *Claudius* Bishop of *Turin*, asserted the contrary Doctrine eighteen or nineteen Years before *Paschasius's* Book upon this Subject was published (which Doctrine was never oppos'd by those who censur'd some other Opinions of his) as *Dr. Allix* shows from a Manuscript Commentary of this Author's upon *St. Matth. Remarks upon the Ancient Church of Piedmont*, p. 62, &c. II. In the same Century, after this Doctrine was published, it met with great Opposition from many eminent Men, such as *Ratramnus*, *Joannes Scotus*, *Anatarius*, *Florus*, *Druthmarus* and *Erigerus*, all which are owned by *Du Pin* to have oppos'd the Doctrine of *Paschasius*, Cent. 9th. p. 84. to whom may be added *Theodolphus* Bishop of *Orleans*, *Walafridus Strabo* Abbot of *Richenou*, *Abto* Bishop of *Basil*, and *Rabanus Maurus* Archbishop of *Mayence*, who did also oppose the Doctrine of *Paschasius* in the same Century; and particularly *Rabanus* in his Penitential, which was written in the Life-time of *Paschasius*, censures his Doctrine about the Eucharist as a Novel Error, as is prov'd in a Dissertation about *Bertram's* Book of the Body and Blood of Christ annexed to the Translation of it, and printed at *London* in 1686.

I shall only add, that the Doctrine of *Bertram's* Book against *Paschasius* about the Eucharist appears plainly to have been generally received by the Church of *England* in the Tenth Century, from the *Paschal Homily* which *Elfric* Archbishop of *Canterbury* translated into the *Saxon* Tongue about the Year 970. which is published at *London* in 1566. and attested to be a true Copy by the Hands of fifteen Prelates and several Noblemen; for this Book was commanded by a Canon to be read publickly to the People, as is observed by *Dr. Cave Hist. Lit. p. 589.* and contains the same Arguments, and for the most part the same Expressions which were us'd by *Bertram* against Transubstantiation, as is prov'd by Archbishop *Usher* in his *Answer to the Jesuites Challenge*, c. 3.

And that *Bertram's* Book was directly levell'd against Transubstantiation, as it is now defin'd by the Council of *Trent* will plainly appear, by citing a few Passages out of many that are in that little Book to this Purpose: For first he says expressly, that the Eucharist is the Body of Christ, not corporally but spiritually, and then he proves, That what is orally receiv'd in the Sacrament, is not Christ's natural Body, because it is incorruptible; whereas that which we receive in the Eucharist, is corruptible and visible: And again, Christ's natural Body had all the organical Parts of a humane Body, and was quickened with a humane Soul, whereas his Body in the Sacrament hath neither; he proves that the Words of the Institution are figurative, because the Symbols have the Name of the Thing signified by them. 2. He says expressly, That as to the Substance of the Creatures, what they were before Consecration, they remain after it. Bread and Wine they were before Consecration, and after it we see they continue Beings of the same kind and nature: He denies any natural Change, and affirms it to be only spiritual and invisible, such as was made of the *Manna* and *Water* in the *Wilderness*, into the Body and Blood of Christ.

These Things are so plainly and frequently asserted in this Book, that I must transcribe the greatest Part of it, if I would produce all the Passages which are to this Purpose; and therefore I cannot but wonder to find *Du Pin* so far mistake the Questions which are handled by *Bertram*, as he does, in the *History* of the Ninth Century, where he makes the Sense of the first Question to be this; *Whether the Body and Blood of Christ be in the Eucharist without a Veil, so as to appear to our outward Eyes*; and the meaning of the Second to be no more than this, *Whether the Body of Christ be in the same manner in the Eucharist, as it was on Earth, and is in Heaven, and whether it be there in as visible and palpable a Manner?* for it cannot be suppos'd that ever any Man in his Wits should maintain that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is visible to our Eyes, with all its Lineaments and Distinction of Parts, and that the Flesh and Bones there are palpable to our Hands; or that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist is both earthly and corruptible as it was upon Earth, and spiritual and incorruptible as it is now in Heaven. These are such wild Imaginations as could never enter into the Mind of any Man of sound Senses; and therefore *Bertram* cannot be suppos'd such a Fool, as to confute them seriously with many Arguments, and that in a Letter to the Emperor; which were no less Ridiculous, than if a Man should write a Book on purpose to prove that a Man does not appear visibly in the shape and figure of a Horse, or a Mouse like an Elephant. The main Question of *Bertram's* Book then is not, as *Du Pin* puts it, *Whether the Body of Christ be in the Eucharist in as visible and palpable a Manner as when he lived upon Earth*; which I believe was never affirmed by any, either in that Age or any other. But, *Whether in the Sacrament we receive the same Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, crucified, and rose again* (supposing what is agreed on all hands that it is not visibly there) and this he flatly denies, and plainly disproves, in direct Opposition to *Paschasius*, and the Doctrine of the present *Roman* Church. He says indeed, the Elements are truly Christ's Body and Blood; but then he explains himself, they are not so as to their visible Nature, but by the Power of the Divine Word; and then he adds, the visible Creature feeds the Body, but the Virtue and Efficacy of the Divine Word feeds and sanctifies the Souls of the Faithful. From which, and many other such like

like Expressions, it plainly appears that he did not believe the Sacrament to be a meer Sign and Figure of Christ's Body and Blood, but thought they were really present, not in a carnal but spiritual Sense. 1. In regard of the spiritual Virtue and Efficacy of them, which by the Divine Blessing is communicated to the Faithful; in which sense only they can be profitable to the Soul, for the Flesh profits it nothing; and if *Du Pin* contends for the Real Presence only in this Sense, the Church of *England* will readily grant it; which has taught her Catechumens to say, *that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and receiv'd by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*. But if he contends for a corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood, the Doctrine of *Bertram* is no less expressly against it, than that of the Church of *England*; and the latter may as easily be reconciled to Transubstantiation, as the former.

And this I have the longer insisted upon, both because most of the Writers of that Age, whom we have alledg'd against Transubstantiation, follow the Principles, and make use of the Arguments and Expressions in *Bertram's* Book, and chiefly because this Book seems to have been the Model by which the first Reformers fram'd this Article of the Eucharist; for so Bishop *Ridley*, who had a great hand in compiling this Article, intimates; as we find in the Preface of a Book *De Cæna Domini*, Printed at *Geneva*, in 1556. where he says, *That it was this Book which first put him upon examining the old Opinion, about the Presence of Christ's very Flesh and Blood, by Scripture and Fathers, and converted him from the Errors of the Church of Rome in this Point*; which is also affirm'd by *Dr. Burnet's* History of the Reformation, Part II. Book I. p. 17. And this is what I thought fit to remark, for the Benefit of the *English* Reader, concerning the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is said to be established in the Thirteenth Century, by *Innocent III.* concerning whom, I observe in the second Place,

That this Pope was the first who published a Crusade against the *Albigenses*, which is a Way of enlightning Mens Understandings, by beating out their Brains, and converting them by the irresistible Force of Sword and Gun; the same way which *Mahomet* us'd for propogating his Religion in the World, was followed by this Pope, whose cruel and barbarous Actions are no less agreeable to the Spirit of *Mahomet*, than they are contrary to that of Christ. The same Pope founded the Office of the Inquisition, which at first did only draw up a Process against Hereticks, and solicit the ordinary Judges to condemn them, but in a little time the Power of judging and condemning Heresy was committed to them, and the Secular Judges did only execute their Sentence. And it is observable, that the Inquisition was established much about the same Time with Transubstantiation; the Cruelty of the one being a fit Match for the Absurdity of the other: And indeed this Holy Office was a necessary Engine to cram down the Throats of Mankind such a choaking Morfel as Transubstantiation.

M. Du Pin in this History has given us some account of the barbarous Proceedings against the *Albigenses* by the Croisade and the Inquisition, without passing any Censure upon these Actions; but lest any should suspect by his Silence, that he approved them, I will now briefly shew you what Opinion he had of all corporal Punishments, when they are used by Ecclesiasticks. And this will appear from his Book of Ecclesiastical Discipline, *Dissert. 7.* where 1st. in the Preface he tells us, *That the Civil Power respects Mens Bodies, which may be forced to a Compliance, and therefore the Civil Magistrate may punish Men with corporal Punishment and Death; but the Ecclesiastical Power respects Mens Minds which cannot be forc'd; and therefore the Governors of this Society can only reclaim Men from their Vices by Exhortations and Commands, which if they do not obey, they can inflict no other Punishment but that of Excommunication.* And then 2^{dly}. in Ch. 1. Sect. 5. of the same Dissertation, he proves that the Church has no Authority in Temporal Affairs, because it cannot force Men by corporal Punishment, and Deprivation of their Goods: For, says he, 'tis a thing unheard of among the Ancients, that the Church should inflict any other Punishment than that of Excommunication, or Deposition. He owns, that after the Emperors became Christian, their Affection to the Christian Religion, and Desire to preserve the Empire in Peace, mov'd them sometimes to banish or fine those who were Ringleaders of Heresy; which was very often done of their own proper motion; and sometimes, but seldom, at the desire of the Fathers of the Church: But it was only in the latter Ages that the Church obtain'd of the Emperors a Power to inflict corporal Punishment. For proof of this he shews, 1st. That Christ gave to the Church no Power but what is spiritual, nor did order the Obstinate and Disobedient to be otherwise punish'd, than by excluding them from Communion. But this is not all, for he shews in the 2^d. place, (whatever Power Churchmen may have received from Magistrates over Mens Bodies) That nothing is more contrary to the Design of the Gospel than such a Power as strikes Terror into the Minds of Men, which he proves from the Words of our Saviour to the Apostles, when they would have call'd for Fire from Heaven upon the Samaritans, Luke 9. 25. Ye know not what Spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man came not to destroy Mens Lives, but to save them. 3^{dly}. He shews, That Christ forbid his Apostles to use the temporal Sword in defence of Religion, from the Rebuke that he gave to St. Peter for drawing his Sword; Put up thy Sword into the Sheath, for all they that take the Sword, shall perish by the Sword, Matth. 26. And lastly, he proves, That Ecclesiasticks cannot use the temporal Sword, or civil Power, to force and punish Men, from the unanimous Consent of the Fathers, whom he there quotes. And this may suffice to shew what Opinion *Du Pin* had of this Wolf of a Pastor, *Innocent III.* and the sanguinary Methods he us'd to extirpate Hereticks, by the Crusade, and the Inquisition; since he declares, not only that Churchmen have no such Power from Christ, and that it was never practis'd in the first and best Ages of the Church, but also, that it is contrary to the Design of the Gospel to use such Cruelties; and to the Mind of Christ to defend, and much more to propagate Religion by such violent and bloody Methods.

The fourteenth Century.

The Fourteenth Century furnishes us with many Subjects very pleasing; for it represents to us the Contests between the Regal Dignity and Priesthood, or rather the Kings and Popes (for the Kingly Function and Priesthood do always fully agree, although the Men who are raised to those great Dignities, differ much about the Bounds of their Power) the Destruction of a famous and powerful Order, the Church of *Rome* divided by a Schism of forty Years Continuance, the Decay of the *Greek* Empire, endangering the Ruin of it, the *Greek* Church disturbed with frivolous Questions, the Order of *Franciscan* Monks torn in pieces by odd Opinions, and extravagant Practices; divers Errors taught by Divines, and condemned by the Bishops, or Universities, and several Disorders suppressed by the Constitutions of Councils, and Bishops. The Divines which flourished in this Age followed the Method of the Schools, as their Predecessors had done. The Commentators upon Holy Scripture, the Preachers, and Monks produced nothing great, nor excellent, and the Historians nothing exact, or perfect. But the Study of the Civil Law came to its Perfection almost, and Human Learning, which had been a long Time neglected, was much studied and improved about the Middle of this Age, by a certain Number of ingenious Men, who, by imitating the Antients, were eminent for their Skill in Languages, Oratory, and Poetry, and brought again into the World a Desire of Antiquity, and a Love of profitable and certain Sciences.

Of the *Authors* Names mentioned in the *Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth* and *Fourteenth Centuries.*

[illegible]

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|
| <p>A</p> <p>A Bbo, 152 Adelardus, 127 Adelinus 153 Ado. <i>ibid.</i> Adrian II. 97 143 Ægil. 151 Æneas of Paris. 103 Agobardus. 49, 121, 131 Aimonius. 152 Aldrevaldus or Albertus. 153 85 88 Alfredus, <i>King of Eng-</i> <i>land.</i> 152 Alfridus <i>Bishop of Munster.</i> 152 Almannus. 152 Alvarus. 151 Amalarius Fortunatus <i>Bi-</i> <i>shop.</i> 130 Amalarius, <i>Deacon.</i> 85 131 Amolo. 56 Anastasius <i>Biblioth.</i> 150 Angelomus. 140 Anonymous Authors <i>a-</i> <i>gainst Paschasius.</i> 185 Anonymous Author of Liber Sydonicus. 150</p> | <p>Anscharius. 152 Ansegisus. 127 Ardo Smaragdus. 137 Asserius. 153 Auxilius. 128</p> <p>B.</p> <p>Benedict III. <i>Pope.</i> 141 Benedict <i>Abbot of Aniana.</i> 136 Bertram. 55 <i>See</i> Patcamnus Clemens.</p> <p>C.</p> <p>Claudius Clemens of Tu- rin. 48. 52</p> <p>D.</p> <p>Druthmarus. 140 Dungalus. 49</p> <p>E.</p> <p>Eginhardus. 150 Elias of <i>Jerusalem.</i> 127 Ermantrarius. 152 Eugenius. 141 Eulogius. 151</p> | <p>F.</p> <p>Florus. 56 Formosus, <i>Pope.</i> 128 129 149</p> <p>G.</p> <p>Gauterius or Wauterius. 127 Georgius Chartophylax. 151 Gildas. 153 Gotteschalcus. 52 <i>and seq.</i> Gregory IV. 141</p> <p>H.</p> <p>Haymo. 140 Halitgarius. 127 Hatto or Hetto. 121 Herardus. 127 Herembertus 152 Hermentricus. 151 Herricus or Erricus. 137 Hilduinus. 151 Hildemar. 151 Hincmarus of Rheims. 53 152 Hincmarus of Laon. 76 Hucbaldus. 152</p> | <p>J.</p> <p>Jesse of Amiens. 130 Ignatius of Constantino- ple. 88 John VIII. <i>Pope.</i> 98 Joannes Scotus. 55 Jonas of Orleans. 48 Joseph of Thessalonica. 51 Isaac of Langres. 127 Iso. 152</p> <p>L.</p> <p>Leidratus. 130 Leo IV. <i>Pope</i> 141 Leo the Wise, <i>Emperor,</i> 151 Ludgerus. <i>ibid</i> Luitbertus. 127 Lupus of Ferrara. 54 <i>ibid</i> 137, 138</p> <p>M.</p> <p>Methodius. 150 Michael Syncellus, <i>ibid.</i> Milo Sigebert. 152</p> | <p>N.</p> <p>Naucratus. 51 Nicephorus. 47 A Nameless Author of the Liber Synodicus. 150 Nameless Authors <i>against</i> Paschasius Ratbertus. 81 85 Nicetas Paphlago. 151 Nicholas I. 89</p> <p>O.</p> <p>Odilbertus 130 Odo. 103 Orthegrinus 152 Otfredus. 153</p> <p>P.</p> <p>Paschal I. 141 Paschasius Radbertus. 79 Photius. 89 Petrus Siculus. 150 Prudentius. 55</p> |
|---|---|---|--|--|

Rabanus

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors* Names.

| | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----|
| R. | Riculphus. 127 | Stephen V. 99, 149 | Theophanes of Nicca. 52 | W. |
| | Rudolphus or Rudolphus. 152 | Stephen VI. 149 | Theophanes Cerameus. 151 | |
| | S. | T. | Theostericus. 52 | |
| Rabanus. 52 132 | | Theganus. 150 | U. | |
| Ratramnus or Bertram. 54 | | Theodorus Graptus. 52 | Ufuardus. 191 | |
| | | Theodorus Abucara. 103 | Vufinus Boetius. 151 | |
| Regino. 118 | Sedulius. 140 | Theodorus Studita. 51 | | |
| Rembertus. 152 | Sergius II. Pope. ibid | | | |
| Remigius of Lyons. 57 | Sergius the Historian. 150 | | | |
| Remigius a Monk. 141 | Smaragdus an Abbot. 137 | | | |

Of the *Tenth* Century.

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| A. | C. | H. | N. | S. |
| A Bbo, or Albo, Abbot of Fleury. 182 | Chilperic, or Helperic; Monk of St. Gallus. 184 | Hatto Archbishop of Mentz. 162 | A Nameless Author Bishop of Germany. 187 | Solomon Bishop of Constance. 187 |
| Adlbero Ep. of Augsburg. 186 | Constantine Porphyrogenneta; Emperor of Constantinople. 151 | Helperic, or Chilperic, Monk of St. Gall. 184 | A Nameless Writer, Monk of St. Vito at Verdun. 184 | Simeon Metaphrastes. 155 |
| Adelbold Ep. of Utrecht. 183 | | Helperic Abbot of Lobes. 183 | Another Nameless Author. 187 | Stephen V. Pope. 171 |
| Adso Abbot of Deuvres. 184 | D. | Hervzus Archbishop of Rheims. 162 173 & seq | Nicephorus the Philosopher. 154 | Stephen Abbot of Lobes, afterward Bishop of Liege. 183 |
| Adso Abbot of Luxeuil. ibid. | Dunstan Archbishop of Canterbury. 189 | Hildebert Archbishop of Mentz. 186 | Nicholas Patriarch of Constantinople. & ibid. seq. | T. |
| Agapetus II. Pope. 158 | Durandus Abbot of Castres. 191 | Hippolytus the Theban. 155 | Nico of Armenia. 155 | Theotmar Metropolitan of Bavaria. 162 |
| Aimoin or Aimonius Monk of Fleury. 163 | E. | J. | Notger the Stammerer Monk of St. Gall. 187 | Thierry, or Theodoric Archbishop of Trier. 187 |
| Albert, or Olbert, Abbot of Gemblours. ibid | Edgar K. of England. 189 | Joannes Cammeniates. 155 | O. | U. |
| Alfrick, or Ælfric, Archbishop of Canterbury. 199 | St. Ethelwald Bishop of Winchester. ibid. | John IX. Pope. 156 162 | Odilo, Abbot of Cluny. 182 | |
| An Anonymous Author Bishop of Germany. 187 | Eutychius, Patriarch of Alexandria. 155 | John X. 157 & 163 | Odilo Monk of St. Medard at Soissons. 184 | Ulric or Uffo, Monk of Werthin. 188 |
| An Anonymous Author Monk of St. Vito at Verdun. 184 | F. | John XII. 159 & 164 | Odo Abbot of Cluny. 181 | St. Ulric Bishop of Augsburg. 184 & sequ. |
| Another Anonymous Writer. 187 | Flodoard, Canon of Rheims. 178 | John XIII. 160 164 | Odo Archbishop of Canterbury. 189 | Utho Bishop of Strasburg. 187 |
| Atto Bishop of Verceil. 168 | Formosus, Pope. 171 | John XV. 164 & 161 | Olbert, or Albert, Abbot of Gemblours. 183 | W. |
| Aurelian Clerk of the Ch. of Rheims. 179 | Fulcus, Archbishop of Rheims. ibid. | John Abbot of St. Arnulphus at Metz. 184 | Osborn Chanter of Canterbury. 190 | |
| B. | Fridegod, Monk of Canterbury. 190 | John Monk of Cluny. 182 | Othlo Monk of Fulda. 188 | |
| Benedict IV. Pope. 156 and 162 | Fulcuin, or Folcuin, Abbot of Lobes. 183 | L. | R. | |
| Benedict VII. Pope. 164 | G. | Lanfrid Monk of Winchester. 190 | Rathboldus, or Radboldus Bishop of Utrecht. 186 | Waltramnus, or Waldramnus, Bishop of Staffburg. 187 |
| Bernerus Monk of St. Remy at Rheims. 179 | Gauterius, Archbishop of Sens. 180 | Lawrence Monk of Liege, and afterward of St. Vito at Verdun. 184 | Ratherius Bishop of Verona. 164 & sequ | William Archbishop of Mentz. 186 |
| Berthier Priest of Verdun. 184 | Gerard St. Ulric's Pupil. 185 | Leo VII. Pope. 158 163 | Reginaldus Bishop of Eichstadt. 187 | Witichindus, Monk of Corby in Saxony. 187 |
| Bishop of Germany nameless. 187 | Gerard, Dean of St. Medard at Soissons. 184 | Letaldus Monk of Micy, or St. Memin. 184 | Roger Monk of St. Pantaloon at Cologne. 186 | Wulfstan Monk of Winchester. 190 |
| Bonno, or Bavo. Abbot of Corby in Saxony. 186 | Gregory V. Pope. 161 | Luitprandus, Bishop of Cremona. 169 | Rolwida a Nun of Ganderheim. 187 | |
| Bruno Archbishop of Cologne. ibid. | | M. | | |
| | | Mancion Bishop of Châlons. 172 | | |
| | | Marinus II. Pope. 158 | | |
| | | Monk Anonymous. 184 | | |
| | | Moses Bar-Cephas Bishop of Syria. 156 | | |

Of the *Eleventh* Century.

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| A Dam, Abbot of Perseme. 247 | of Cluny. 204 and sequ. | Ascelin, a Monk of St. Evrou. 197 | Berthorius Abbot of Mount Cassin. 247 | Clement II. Pope. 206 |
| Adam, Canon of Bremen. 249 | Alphanus, Archbishop of Salerno. 249 | B. | Bertulphus or Bernulphus, a Priest of Constance, 199 and 249 | Conrad, Bishop of Utrecht. 247 |
| Adelman, or Alman, a Clerk of the Church of Liege, and afterwards Bishop of Brescia. 197 | Amatus, a Bishop in Italy. ibid. | Baudry, Bishop of Dol. 199 | Bovo, Abbot of St. Berthin. 250 | Conrad, a Monk of Bruvilliers. 249 |
| Ademar, or Aimar de Chabanois, a Monk of St. Cibar. 248 | Anastasiu, a Monk of St. Sergius at Angers. 199 | Benedict VIII. Pope. 206 | Britwol, Bishop of Winchester. 250 | Constantin Lichudes, Patriarch of Constantinople. 252 |
| Ægilnothus, Archbishop of Canterbury. 247 | Andrew, a Monk of Fleury. 250 | Benno, Cardinal. 247 | Bruno or Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers, 197 and 198 | D. |
| Alberic, a Monk of Mount Cassin. 199 | St. Anselm. Archbishop of Canterbury. 205 and sequ. | Berengarius or Berenger, Arch-Deacon of Angers, 196 and sequ. | Bruno, Bishop of Wurtzburg. 246 | Desiderius, Abbot of Mount Cassin, and afterwards Pope under the Name of Victor III. 231 and 249 |
| Alberic, Cardinal. 250 | Anselm, Bishop of Lucca. 247 | Bernard, a Monk of Cluny. 247 | Burchard. Bishop of Worms. 246 | Deus-dedit Cardinal. 247 |
| Albert, a Benedictin Monk of Mets. 249 | Anselm, Dean of Namur. 248 | Bernard, a Monk of Corbie in Saxony. ibid. | C. | Diodericus, a Monk of Hirsfeldt. 250 |
| Alexander II. Pope. 198 | Anselm, a Benedict in Monk of Rheims. 249 | Bernard, a Clerk of the Church of Utrecht. ibid. | Campanus, Philosopher of Lombardy. 247 | Dithmar, Bishop of Merzburg. 248 |
| Alexius, Patriarch of Constantinople. 251 | Aribo, Archbishop of Mentz. 246, 261 | Berno, Abbot of Richenaw. 246 | Cedrenus, a Greek Monk. 252 | Dominick, Patriarch of Grado. 236 |
| Alger, a Deacon of Liege, and afterward Monk | Arnold, a Canon of Hirsfeldt. 247 | Bertha, Nun of Willock. 250 | | |
| | Arnulphus, a Monk of St. Emmeran at Ratisbonne. 248 | | | |

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors* Names.

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Drogo, a Monk of St. Win- noch. 248 | Gislebert or Gilbert, a Monk of Westminster, 245 | John Thracensis Scylitz- es Curopalata. 252 | O. | T. |
| Durandus, Abbot of Tro- arn. 197 and 203 | Glaber Radulphus, a Monk of Cluny. 248 | John Xiphilin, Patri- arch of Constantino- ple, ibid. | Odo, a Monk of St. Maur des Fosses. 250 | Tangmarus, Dean of Hil- desheim. 247 |
| E. | Godehard, Bishop of Hil- desheim. 246 | Jotsald, a Monk of Clu- ny. 250 | Ordoran, a Monk of St. Peter le Vif. 248 | Thibaud or Theobald a Clerk of the Church of Etampes. 258 |
| Eadmer, a Monk of Can- terbury, 245 and 262 | Gonthier or Gonthierus, a Monk of St. Amand, 249 | L. | Osbert or Osbern, a Monk and Chanter of Canter- bury. 247 | Theoduin or Diettoin, Bishop of Liege. 197 and 199 |
| Eberard, St. Harvic's Pu- pil. 248 | Gosbert, Abbot of Ter- gernsee. 246 | Lambert, Bishop of Ar- ras. 232 | Othlo, a Monk of St. Bo- niface. 249 | Theophanes, the Cera- mean Archbishop of Tauromenium. 251 |
| Ebervin or Evervin, Ab- bot of St. Maurice at Tolen 248 | Gotzelin, a Monk of Can- terbury. 250 | Lambert, of Aschaffem- burg, a Monk of Hirf- feldt. 249, and 262 | P. | Theophylact, Archbishop of Acris. 252 |
| Egilnoth, See Ægilno- thus. 247 | Gregory VI. Pope. 206 | Lanfrank, Archbishop of Canterbury. 198, 199 and sequ. | Paul, Provost of Benrie- den. 249 | Thierry or Theodoric, Bishop of Verdun. 213 |
| Egerward, a Monk of St. Burchard at Wurtz- burg. 250 | Gregory VII. Pope. 199 and 210 sequ. ibid. | Leo IX. Pope. 198, 206 and sequ. | Peter, Patriarch of An- tioch. 237 & sequ. | Thierry, Abbot of St. Tru- do. 249 |
| Engelbert, Archbishop of Trier. 213 | Gregory Cardinal. 247 | Leo surnam'd the Gram- marian, 251 | Peter Chartophylax, or Keeper of the Records of the Church of Constan- tinople. 252 | V. |
| Erard, a Benedictin Monk, 247 | Grimaldus. 250 | M. | Peter Damian, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, 238 & sequ. | Valeran, Bishop of Naum- berg. 244 |
| Erchenfroy, or Erchin- froy, Abbot of Melck, 248 | Gualdo, a Monk of Cor- bie. 248 | Manasses, Archbishop of Rheims. 224, 225 and sequ. | Peter de Honestis, a Clerk of Ravenna. 242 | Victor II. Pope 198, and 207 |
| Evershelm, Abbot of Au- mont. 249 | Guarlin or Gauclin, Arch- bishop of Bourges. 194 and 196 | Marianus Scotus. 249 | Peter, a Monk of Maille- zais. 250 | Victor III. Pope. 231 |
| Eugesippus. 251 | Guibert, Arch-Deacon of Toul. 249 | Maurillus, Archbishop of Roan. 198, and 259 | R. | Ulric, a Monk of Cluny. 247 |
| Eusebius Bruno, Bishop of Angers. 197 and 198 | Guitmond, Archbishop of Aversa. 199, and 246 | Megenfroy or Megin- froy, a Monk of Ful- da. 247 | Raimond, a Monk of St. Andrew at Avignon, 250 | Urban II. Pope. 231 and sequ. |
| F. | Guy Arcin Abbot of La Croix St. Leufroy. 246 | Metellus, Abbot of Ter- gernsee. 249 | Rainold or Reginald, Archbishop of Rheims, 232 & 258 | Urfio, Abbot of Aumont. 249 |
| Folcard, a Monk of St. Berthin. 249 | H. | Michael Cerularius, Pa- triarch of Constanti- nople. 234, and 237 | Robert de Tombalene, Abbot of St. Vigor at Bayeux. 246 | W. |
| Franco a Philosopher of Liege, 244 | Helgaud, a Monk of Fleu- ry. 248 | Michael Pfellus, a Sena- tor of Constantinople. 251 | Roscelin, a Clerk of the Church of Compeigne, 244 | W. a Monk of Walsor. 250 |
| St. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, 194 and sequ. | Hugh Bishop of Die and afterwards Archbishop of Lyons, 199, 219, 225, and 231 | N. | Rudolf, a Monk of La Chaise Dieu. 250 | Warin, Abbot of St. Ar- nulphus at Mets. 246 |
| G. | Hugh, Bishop of Langres, 202 | Nalgod, a Monk of Clu- ny. 249 | Rupert, Abbot of Mount Cassin. 248 | Warman, Bishop of Con- stance. 250 |
| Gauffroy or Geoffrey de Maletterre, a Monk of Normandy. 249 | Hugh Arch-Deacon of Tours. 248 | Nicetas Pectoratus, a Monk of Studa. 235 and sequ. and 251 | S. | Weneric, Bishop of Ver- ceil. 247 |
| Gaunilon an English Monk. 244 | Humbert, Cardinal, 198 200 & sequ. | Nicetas Serron, Archbi- shop of Heraclea. 252 | Samonas, Archbishop of Gaza. 252 | Willeran, Abbot of St. Peter at Mersburg. 249 |
| Gautier of Rieux. 250 | I. | Nicolas II. Pope. 198 208 and sequ. | Samuel of Morocco, a converted Jew, ibid. | William, Abbot of St. Ar- nulphus at Mets. 246 |
| Georgius Cedrenus, a Greek Monk. 252 | Ingelran, Abbot of St. Riquier. 250 | Nicolas, Bishop of Me- thone. 252 | Simeon, surnamed the Young, Abbot of Xe- rocere. 251 | William, Abbot of St Be- nignus at Dijon. 206 |
| Gerard, Abbot of St. Vin- cent at Laon. 249 | Ingulphus, Abbot of Croyland. 249 | Nicolas, surnam'd the Grammarian Patriarch of Constantinople. 252 | Stephen XI. Pope. 208 | William of Apulia. 249 |
| Gerard de Venna, a Monk of La Chaise Dieu. 250 | John XVI. Pope. 205 | Nilus Doxopatrius Ar- chimandrita. 251 | Sylvester II. Pope. 205 | St. William Abbot of Ri- chenaw. 250 |
| Gervase, Archbishop of Rheims. 208 | John XVII. Pope. ibid. | Norcherus, Abbot of Hautvilliers. 250 | Syrus, a Monk of Cluny, 247 | William, a Monk of Chi- usi in Tuscany. 250 |
| Gislebert, a Monk of St. Germain at Auxerre, 250 | John XVIII. Pope. 206 | | | Wippo or Wippo, Chap- lain to the Emperor Henry. 248 |
| Gislebert, a Monk of St. Amand. ibid. | John, Archbishop of Eu- chaita. 252 | | | Wolferus, a Canon of Hil- desheim, 259 |
| | John surnam'd Jeannelin, Abbot of Erbrestein. 246 | | | |

Of the Twelfth Century.

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| A. | Alexis Aristenes Stewart, of the Church of Con- stantinople. 377 | Archardus a Monk of Clairvaux. 374 | Basil of Acris, Archbishop of Thessalonica. 276 | Celestine II. Pope. 287 288 |
| A Baelardus, a famous Philosopher. 289 292 300 304 | Alulphus, a Monk of St. Martin at Tournay. 368 | Ariulphus a Monk of St. Riquier; see Hariul- phus. 374 | Baudry Bishop of Dol. 374 | Celestine III. Pope. 333 335 |
| Adamus Scotus, a Regu- lar Canon. 368 | Amedeus Bishop of Laufa- na. 366 | Arnulphus or Arnoldus Bishop of Lisieux. 352 | Baudry Bishop of Noyon and Terouane. ibid. | Christian, a Monk of Cla- irvaux. 368 |
| Adelbert or Albert, Ab- bot of Hildesheim. 375 | Anacletus Antipope. 288 | Arnulphus or Ernulphus, Bishop of Rochester. 349 | St. Bernard. 291 & 319 325 328 329 | Chryfolanus or Grosela- nus. 281 |
| Adrian IV. Pope. 331 333 | Anastasiu IV. Pope. 331 333 | Arfenius a Monk of Mount Athos. 377 | Bernard Abbot of St. A- nastasiu, afterwards Pope under the name of Eugenius III. 291 292 305 306 | Clement III. Pope. 333 335 |
| Aelnothus a Monk of Can- terbury. 374 | Andronicus Camaterus. 377 | Aucts Abbot of Valomber. 374 | Bernard Abbot of Font- caud. 363 | Constantinus Harmeno- pulus. 376 |
| St. Aelred or Ethelred, Abbot of Reverby. 312 367 | Anna Comnena. 378 | B. | Bernard a Monk of Cluny. 366 | Constantinus Manasses. ibid. |
| Alanus Bishop of Auxer- re. 374 | Anonymous Authors, Vide, Nameless Authors. | Baldwin Archbishop of Canterbury. 368 | Bertrand Abbot of La chaise dieu. 374 | D. |
| Albertus or Albericus, a Canon of Aix. 374 | Anscherus, Abbot of St. Riquier. 374 | Balfamon Patriarch of An- tioch. 378 | Bonacursus. 319 | Demetrius Tornicius. 378 |
| Alexander III. Pope. 331 334 ibid. | Anselm Abbot of Gem- blours. 370 | Bartholomew Bishop of Oxford. 369 | St. Bruno. 350 | Domniso a Priest. 374 |
| Alexander Abbot in Sici- ly. 375 | Anselm Dean of Laon. 321 164 | Bartholomew Bishop of Foigny, 367 | Bruno Bishop of Signi. 281 351 | Drogo or Dreux, Cardi- nal Bishop of Ostia 365 |
| | Anselm Bishop of Havel- berg. 365 | | Calixtus II. Pope, 283 284 287 | Esbo |
| | Antonius Melissus a Gre- cian Monk. 377 | | | |

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors* Names.

| | | | | | |
|----|---|--|--|----|---|
| E. | <p>Gilbert <i>Abbot of Hoiland</i> 312 367 Gilbert of Sempringham. 368 Gilbert Foliot <i>Bishop of London.</i> 368 Gilbert <i>Bishop of Limerick.</i> 364 Gillebert or Gilbert de la Porrée <i>Bishop of Poitiers.</i> 329 Gislebert or Gilbert Crispin, <i>Abbot of Westminster.</i> 364 Godfrey of Viterbo. 370 Gonthierus a <i>Monk of St. Amand.</i> 375 Gratian. 387 Gregory VIII. <i>Pope.</i> 333 Gualbert a <i>Monk of Marchiennes.</i> 374 Gueric <i>Abbot of Igny.</i> 312 Guibert <i>Abbot of Nogent.</i> 374 345 Guigue <i>Prior of la Grande Chartreuse,</i> 312 Guy <i>Archbishop of Vienna.</i> 282 283 287</p> | <p>Innocent II. <i>Pope.</i> 278 289 299 316 325 Johannes Burgundus a <i>Magistrate of Pisa.</i> 369 Johannes Camaterus <i>Patriarch of Constantinople.</i> 379 Johannes Cinnamus the <i>Gramarian.</i> 377 Johannes Phocas a <i>Greecian Monk.</i> 378 Johannes Zonaras <i>Secretary of State to the Emperor of Constantinople.</i> ibid John <i>Bishop of Lydda.</i> ibid John the Hermit. 312 John a <i>Carthusian Monk of Portes.</i> 369 John a <i>Monk of Marmoutier.</i> 312 John <i>Patriarch of Antioch.</i> 375 John Brompton <i>Abbot of Jorval.</i> 376 John of Cornwall. 370 John of Hexam <i>Provost of Hagulfstadt.</i> 367 John of Salisbury <i>Bishop of Chartres.</i> 371 John Pyke an <i>English Author.</i> 340, 356 John Phocas a <i>Greek Monk.</i> 371 Isaac <i>Abbot of L'Etoile.</i> 378 Isaac an <i>Armenian Bishop.</i> 368 Ivo or Ives <i>Bishop of Chartres,</i> 375 & 266</p> | <p>Mary, <i>attributed to St. Anselm.</i> 298 A <i>nameless Writer of the Life of St. Ludger.</i> 374 A <i>nameless Dean of Reichenberg.</i> 368 Neophytus a <i>Greek Monk</i> 378 Nicephorus Bryennius of <i>Macedonia.</i> ibid Nicetas of <i>Constantinople.</i> 376 Nicetas Seidus. 375 Nicholas a <i>Canon of Liege.</i> 374 Nicholas a <i>Monk of Clairvaux.</i> 312 Nicholas a <i>Monk of St. Alban.</i> 298 Nicholas <i>Monk of Soissons.</i> 374 St. Norbert. 350</p> | R. | <p>Radulphus, or Raoul L'Arden. 364 Radulphus de Diceto, <i>Dean of St. Paul's London.</i> 375 Radulphus Niger or le Noir, a <i>Monk of St. Germer.</i> 367 Radulphus Tortarius. 374 Raimond d'Agiles a <i>Canon of Puy.</i> 372 Rainoldus of Semur, <i>Archbishop of Lyons</i> 374 Richard <i>Abbot of Mount-Cassin.</i> 365 Richard <i>Prior of Hagulfstad.</i> 373 Richard of St. Victor. 386 Robert <i>Archdeacon of Ostrevant.</i> 374 Robert a <i>Monk of St. Remy, at Rheims.</i> 373 Robert of Flamesbury a <i>Regular Canon of St. Victor.</i> 369 Robert of Melun <i>Bishop of Hereford.</i> 385 Robert of Florigny, <i>Abbot of Mount St. Michael.</i> 347 Robertus Paululus a <i>Priest of Amiens.</i> 384 Robertus Pullus <i>Cardinal.</i> 384 Rodulphus <i>Abbot of St. Tron.</i> 366 Rogel de Hoveden <i>Professor of Oxford.</i> 371 Rupert <i>Abbot of Duyts.</i> 385 St.</p> |
| F. | <p>Fabricius Tuscus <i>Abbot of Abington.</i> 374 Falco a <i>Magistrate of Benevento.</i> 373 Fastredus <i>Abbot of Clairvaux.</i> 306 Florentinus Bravo a <i>Monk of Winchester.</i> 370 Foucher a <i>Monk of Chartres.</i> 374 Franco <i>Abbot of Afflighem.</i> 364</p> | L. | <p>Odo <i>Abbot of Bel.</i> 368 Odo <i>Abbot of St. Remy at Rheims.</i> 367 Odo a <i>Regular Canon.</i> 367 Odo <i>Bishop of Cambrai,</i> 764 Odo a <i>Benedictin Monk of Ast.</i> 351 Odo of Chirton 369 Odo of Deuil, <i>Abbot of St. Cornelius.</i> 374 Ogerus <i>Abbot of Lucedia</i> 312 Oliver of Colen. 374 Ordericus Vitalis a <i>Monk of Evrou.</i> 370 Otho <i>Bishop of Frisingen</i> ibid. Otho of St. Blaise. ibid</p> | P. | <p>Sampson <i>Archbishop of Rheims.</i> 297, 306 Saxo Grammaticus <i>Provost of Roschild.</i> 375 Serlo <i>Abbot of Savigny.</i> 367 Sibrandus <i>Abbot of Mariengard.</i> 374 Sifredus. ibid. Sigebert a <i>Monk of Gemblours.</i> 347 Simeon of Durham, 371 Simeon of Logotheta. 377 Stephen <i>Abbot of St. James's at Liege.</i> 362 Stephen <i>Bishop of Autun.</i> 365 Stephen <i>Bishop of Paris.</i> ibid Stephen <i>Bishop of Tournay.</i> 361 Stephen de Chaulmet a <i>Carthusian Monk of Portes.</i> 369 Stephen Harding <i>Abbot of Cîteaux.</i> 291, 350 Suger <i>Abbot of St. Denis.</i> 317, 290 Sylvester Giraldus <i>Bishop of St. Davids.</i> 371</p> |
| G. | <p>Garnerius <i>Abbot of Clairvaux.</i> 368 Garnerius of St. Victor. 369 Galterius or Walter <i>Archdeacon of Oxford.</i> 371 Galterius a <i>Canon of Terrouane.</i> 374 Galterius <i>Bishop of Maguelone.</i> 365 Galterius of Chatillon. 369 Galterius of Mauritania, <i>Bishop Laon.</i> 367 Galterius of St. Victor. 385 Galterius le Chancelier. 374 Gelafius II. <i>Pope.</i> 282 287 Geoffrey <i>Abbot of Clairvaux, the Disciple of St. Bernard,</i> 312 330 Geoffrey <i>Abbot of Igny.</i> 312 Geoffrey <i>Abbot of Vendome</i> 341 Geoffrey <i>Abbot of Chartres</i> 295 306 365 Geoffrey <i>Prior of Vigcois</i> 372 Geoffrey Arthur <i>Bishop of St. Asaph.</i> 371 Geoffrey the Gross, a <i>Monk of Tiron.</i> 374 Geoffrey or Walter de Vinefauf. 373 George <i>Arch-bishop of Corfu.</i> 377 George Xiphylin <i>Patriarch of Constantinople.</i> 378 Germanus <i>Patriarch of Constantinople.</i> 377 Gerochus <i>Provost of Reichenberg.</i> 364 Gervase a <i>Monk of Canterbury.</i> 371 Gervase a <i>Priest of Chichester.</i> 368</p> | <p>Laborantius <i>Cardinal.</i> 368 Lawrence a <i>Monk of a Liege.</i> 375 Leo <i>Cardinal Deacon.</i> ibid Leo of Marfi, <i>Cardinal Bishop of Ostia.</i> ibid Lucas Chrysobergius <i>Patriarch of Constantinople.</i> 377 Lucius II. <i>Pope.</i> 290 319 Lucius III. <i>Pope.</i> 329 Luke <i>Abbot of St. Cornelius.</i> 367 Lupus Protospatus. 378</p> | <p>Pandulphus of Pisa. 374 Paschal II. <i>Pope</i> 279 286 284 Peter <i>Abbot of Clairvaux.</i> 368 Peter <i>Abbot of Cluny.</i> 305 Peter <i>Library-keeper of Mount Cassin.</i> 365 Peter of Blois, <i>Archdeacon of Bath.</i> 356 &c. Peter of Celles <i>Bishop of Chartres.</i> 298 317 355 Peter of Leon <i>Anti-Pope, under the Name of Anacletus.</i> 288 291 Peter of Poitiers <i>Chancellor of the Church of Paris.</i> 384 Peter de Riga a <i>Canon of Rheims.</i> 368 Peter de Roye a <i>Monk of Clairvaux.</i> 306 Peter the Venerable <i>Abbot of Cluny.</i> 313 326 Peter Lombard <i>Bishop of Paris.</i> 380 Petrus Abaelardus. 321 Petrus Alphonsus a <i>Spanish Jew Converted.</i> 364 Petrus Comestor <i>Dean of St. Peter's at Troyes.</i> 369 Petrus Theutobodus. 371 Philip <i>Bishop of Tarentum or Taranto.</i> 366 Philip a <i>Monk of Clairvaux.</i> 312 Philip de Harvenge <i>Abbot of Bonne-Esperance.</i> 568 Philippus Solitarius a <i>Greek Monk.</i> 375 Potho a <i>Monk of Prom.</i> 366 Pullus <i>Cardinal.</i> 384</p> | T. | <p>Teulphus a <i>Monk of Maurigny.</i> 375 Theobaldus a <i>Clerk of the Church of Etampes.</i> 364 Theobaldus a <i>Monk of St. Peter at Beze.</i> 374 Theodoricus an <i>Abbot.</i> 371 Theodoricus or Thierry a <i>Monk.</i> 373 Theodorus Balsamon <i>Patriarch of Antioch.</i> 378 Theofredus <i>Abbot of Epternach.</i> 374 Theodorianus</p> |
| | <p>J.</p> <p>James de Vhry <i>Cardinal</i> 374</p> | <p>M.</p> <p>Marbodius <i>Bishop of Rennes.</i> 351 Maurice of Sully, <i>Bishop of Paris.</i> 161 Michael Anchialus <i>Patriarch of Constantinople</i> 478 Michael of Thessalonica. 377 Michael Glycas of Sicily. 376</p> <p>N.</p> <p>Nameless Writers. Two Nameless Authors <i>Epitomizers of Foucher.</i> 374 A nameless Author of the <i>History of Jerusalem.</i> ibid A nameless Author of the <i>Expedition of the Danes to the Holy Land.</i> 375 A nameless Italian <i>Writer of the Acts of the French in the Levant.</i> 371 A nameless Author of a <i>Treatise about the Conception of the Virgin.</i></p> | <p>P.</p> <p>Petrus Comestor <i>Dean of St. Peter's at Troyes.</i> 369 Petrus Theutobodus. 371 Philip <i>Bishop of Tarentum or Taranto.</i> 366 Philip a <i>Monk of Clairvaux.</i> 312 Philip de Harvenge <i>Abbot of Bonne-Esperance.</i> 568 Philippus Solitarius a <i>Greek Monk.</i> 375 Potho a <i>Monk of Prom.</i> 366 Pullus <i>Cardinal.</i> 384</p> | | |

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors Names.*

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Theorianus. 377 | | Wacelinus Momalius Pri- or of St Lawrence of Liege. 366 | Monk of Malmesbury. ibid. | |
| Theutbodus. 371 | V. | William Abbot of S. Thier- ry. 304, 306, 324 | Wolbero Abbot of St Pantaleon at Colen. 361 | Z. |
| Thimo. 374 | | William Archbishop of Tyre. 374 | | |
| Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury. 336 | Udaschalcus a Monk. 375 | William de Champeaux Bishop of Chalons. 283 | Yves Bishop of Chartres. 266 | Zachary, Bishop of Chry- topolis. 369 |
| Thomas Abbot of Mau- rigny. 366 | Ulgerus Bishop of Angers. 366 | | | Zonaras Secretary of State to the Emperor of Con- stantinople. 378 |
| Thomas a Monk of Cif- reaux. 369 | Urban III. Pope. 333 | | | |
| Thomas a Monk of Ely. 374 | W. | William a Regular Canon of Newbery. 371 | | |
| Turstin Archbishop of York. ibid. | Waker Archdeacon of Ox- ford. 371 | William of Somerset a | | |

Of the *Thirteenth Century.*

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| A. | | Conrade Abbot of Ever- back. 428 | Gerard Monk of St. Quen- tin of Lille. 429 | Humbert of Romans Ge- neral of the Order of Dominicans. 435 | Matthew of Aquasporta Cardinal. 438 |
| Abfalom Abbot of Spinkerback. 426 | | Conrade, a German, of the Order of the Domi- nicans. 438 | Gerard of Frachet of the Order of Dominicans. 435 | | Matthew Paris Monk of St. Albans. 436 |
| Adam of Barkinghen. 427 | | Conrade a German Bi- shop. 435 | Gerard of Liege of the Order of Dominicans. 439 | J. | Matthew of Vendome. 437 |
| Adam of Chamilly. 439 | | Conrade Prior of Schur. 428 | Germanus Nauplius Pa- triarch of Constantino- ple. 443 | James of Vitry Cardi- nal. 429 | Maurice Archbishop of Roan. 428 |
| Alanus of L'Isle, the Uni- versal Doctor. 426 | | Conrade of Halberstad. 434 | St. Gertruda Abbess of Helfenden. 438 | James of Voragine ABp. of Genes. 439 | Michael Acominates ABp of Athens. 443 |
| Alanus. 423 | | Conrade of Lichtenaub. 428 | Gervais of Tilbury. 427 | Innocent III. Pope. 396, 401, 422, 427, 448, 486 | Moneta a Dominican. 439 |
| Alberick Cistercian Monk. 439 | | Conrade of Marburg of the Order of Domini- cans. 429 | Gilbert Abbot of Gemb- lours. 426 | Innocent IV. 399, 423, 429, 475 | N. |
| Alberick Verus Regular Canon of St. Augustin. 435 | | Constantine Acropolita Logothetes. 445 | Gilbert Martin Abbot of Gemblours. ibid | Innocent V. 424 | Nicephorus Blemmidas. 443 |
| Albert Patriarch of Jeru- salem. 427 | | Constantine Meliteniotes Archdeacon of Constan- tinople. 444 | Gilbert of Tournay of the Order of Franciscans. 437 | Joachim Abbot of Flora. 425 | Nicetus ABp. of Thessa- lonica. 442 |
| Albert Abbot of Stade, &c. 435 | | Constantine of Orvieto. 435 | Giles Monk of Orval. 435 | Job Jasites. 445 | Nicetas Acominates Chio- niates Logothetes. 442 |
| Albert Prior of Mont des Vignes at Pavia. 428 | | | Giles of Affisi of the Or- der of Franciscans. 432 | Joseline of Brakelonde. 427 | Nicholas III. Pope. 422 |
| Albertus Magnus Bishop of Ratisbon. 432 | | D. | Gobelinus. 438 | Joel the Greek. 443 | Nicholas IV. ibid. |
| Albertanus Advocate of Bresse. 439 | | David of Augsburg of the Order of the Francis- cans. 435 | Godfrey Monk of St. Pan- taleon. 429 | John XXI. Pope. 424 | Nicholas of Hanaps. 437 |
| Alexander IV. Pope. 400 | | Dodechin Abbot of Di- fibode. 427 | Godfrey the Bald Arch- bishop of Bourges. 435 | John Abbot of Fordeham. 427 | Nicholas the Gaul. 428 |
| Alexander of Dol. 438 | | E. | Gonthier Monk of Paris in the Diocess of Basil. 427 | John Algrin of Abbevil- le Cardinal. 428 | Nicholas of Otrantes. 442 |
| Alexander of Hales Friar Minor. 432 | | Eckerhard Dean of St. Gal 428 | Gregory IX. Pope. 423 | John Beletha a Parisian Doctor. 426 | O. |
| Alexander Neckam Ab- bot of Exeter. 428 | | St. Edmond Archbishop of Canterbury. 429 | Gregory X. Pope. 401 | John Christophilus a Do- minican. 436 | Odo Rigald Archbishop of Roan. 439 |
| Alexander of Somerset, Prior of Esby. 440 | | Engelbert Abbot of the Cistercian Order. 435 | Gregory Abulpharaje an Arabian. 445 | John Colonna Archbi- shop of Messina. 435, | P. |
| Amand Suzon Friar Preacher. 439 | | Engelhard Abbot of Lan- kaim. 439 | Gregory of Winchester a Monk of Gloucester. 538 | John de Dieu Canon of Bolong. 438 | Pantaleon Deacon of Con- stantinople. 443 |
| Andrew Sylvius Abbot of Marchiennes. 427 | | | Guy of Baif Archdeacon of Bolong. 438 | John de Galles a Francis- can. 437 | Peter of Auvergne a Do- minican. 434 |
| St. Anthony of Padua. 428 | | F. | Guy of Munioise Abbot of St. Germain of Auxer- re. 439 | John Gal Abbot of Fon- tenelle. 428 | Peter Chanter of Paris. 426 |
| Arlottus General of the Or- der of Franciscans. 438 | | Fabian Hugelin of the Or- der of Franciscans. 428 | H. | John Genes de la Caille. 437 | Peter Monk of the Valleys of Cernay. 427 |
| Arnoldus Abbot of Lubec. 427 | | St. Francis of Affisi. ibid. | Hannibal of Annebaud Cardinal. 436 | John Grey Bishop of Nor- wich. 427 | Peter a Dominican Pro- vincial. 439 |
| Ansenius Autorianus Pa- triarch of Constantino- ple. 444 | | Francis of Moncade. Mar- quiss of Ayeton. 439 | Helinand Monk of Froi- mont. 428 | John of Hayde. 438 | Peter of Benevento Car- dinal. 422 |
| B. | | | Henry Count of Calva Abbot of Richenou. ibid. | John of Nusco of Mons- Virginis. 439 | Peter of Corbeil Arch- bishop of Sens. 426 |
| Ealdwin Regular Canon of Premontre. 439 | | G. | Henry Monk of Afflighem. 438 | John of Oxford Dean of Sa- lisbury. 427 | Peter des Vignes. 435 |
| Baldwin Emperor of Con- stantinople. 427 | | Garfias the Spaniard. ibid. | Henry of Sula Cardinal. 436 | John of Parma. 437 | Peter of Tarentum, see Innocent V. |
| Bartholomew of Bresse Professor of the Canon Law. 435 | | Geofry of Beaulieu Con- fessor King of St. Lewis. 437 | Henry of Gaunt Arch- deacon of Tournay. 439 | John Peckham. 437 | Philip of Greve. 429 |
| Benedict Bishop of Mar- seilles. 439 | | Geofry of Villehardwin. 427 | Henry or Amand Sufon of the Order of Domi- nicans. ibid. | John of Rochel a Fra- ciscans. 432 | Prepositivus a Divine of Paris. 427 |
| Bernard Bishop of Fayence 422 | | George Acropolites Lo- gothetes. 443 | Hervard Archdeacon of Liege. 426 | John Semeca Provost of Halberstad. 436 | R. |
| Bernard of Compostella Chaplain to Innocent IV. 435 | | George of Cyprus, fir- named Gregory, Pa- triarch of Constantino- ple. 444 | Honorius III. Pope. 397 | John the Teutonick Bp. of Bosena. 439 | Raimond of Martin. a Dominican. 438 |
| St. Bonaventure Cardi- nal. 432 | | George Metochites Dea- con of the Church of Constantinople. ibid. | Honorius IV. 424 | John Vecceus. 444 | St. Raimond of Penna- fort. 431 |
| Bonaventure Brocard of the Order of the Domi- nicans. 437 | | George Moschamper Keeper of the Archives of the Church of Con- stantinople. 445 | Hugh Regular Canon of Floress. 429 | Jordanus General of the Dominicans. | Rainier Sacho a Domi- can. 436 |
| C. | | George Pachymeres. 444 | Hugh Regular Canon of St. Marian Auxerre 427 | L. | Ralph Bocking a Domi- nican. 437 |
| Celestin V. Pope. 424 | | | Hugh of St. Charus Car- dinal. 432 | Lambert of Liege. 427 | Ralph the Black an En- glishman. 440 |
| Cesarus of Heisterback Prior of Villiers. 427 | | | Hugh White Monk of Peterburgh. 427 | Luke Bishop of Tuy. 429 | Ralph of Colonna Can- on of Chartres. 438 |
| Clement IV. Pope. 424 | | | | Luke of Padua. 439 | Riccerus the Disciple of St. Francis. 428 |
| | | | | M. | Richard Canon of Lon- don. 427 |
| | | | | St. Matilda a Benedictin Nun. 438 | Richard of St. Lawrence. 432 |
| | | | | Manuel Charitopula. 443 | Richard of Middleton a Franciscan. 439 |
| | | | | Mark a Greek Monk. 445 | Rigord |
| | | | | Martin IV. Pope. 424 | |
| | | | | Martin the Polander. 432 | |

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors* Names.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Nigord <i>Historiographer of France.</i> 428 | Simon Monk of Afflighem. 438 | Thomas Bockingham. 439 | Walter Cornu <i>Archbishop of Sens.</i> 429 | William of Chartres 437 |
| Robert Regular Canon of Premontre. 427 | Simon Priest of Tour-nay. 426 | Thomas of Celano a <i>Franciscan.</i> 429 | Walter of Exeter a <i>Domini-can.</i> 439 | William Durant <i>Bp. of Menda.</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Robert Bacon <i>Doctor of Oxford.</i> 435 | Simon of Crete a <i>Domini-can.</i> 444 | Thomas of Chantpre. 434 | Walter Mapes <i>Archdeacon of Oxford.</i> 427 | William Guarron a <i>Franciscan.</i> 437 |
| Robert Corceon <i>Cardinal.</i> 426 | Stephanard a <i>Divine of Milan.</i> 438 | Thomas of Lentini. 437 | Wernerus <i>Abbot of St. Blaife.</i> 426 | William de la Mare a <i>Franciscan.</i> 438 |
| Robert Grostead <i>Bp. of Lincoln.</i> 429 | Stephen Monk of Cella-Nova. 439 | Thomas Palmeranus. 438 | Wilbrand of Oldenburgh. 427 | William of Nangis. 428 |
| Robert Rich of Abington. 435 | Stephen Langton. 427, 446, 456 | Thomas Spott or Sprotr. 437 | William Abbot of Andres. 428 | William the Pilgrim. 426 |
| Robert or Rupert of Ruf-fia. 438 | T. | V. | William Deacon of Bour-ges. 439 | William Perault a <i>Do-minican.</i> 434 |
| Robert of Sorbonne. 437 | Tagenon <i>Dean of Pavia.</i> 426 | Veccus, <i>see John Vcc-cus.</i> | William Bishop of Paris 427, 430 | William of Puilaurent. 427 |
| Roderick Ximenes. 428 | Theodore Lascaris, <i>fir-named Ducas, the Greek Emperor.</i> 443 | Vincent of Beauvais. 431 | William Monk of St. De-nis. 428 | William of Rishauger. 436 |
| Roger <i>Historiographer of Hungary.</i> 435 | Thierri of Apolda. 438 | Ulric of Strasburg a <i>Do-minican.</i> 433, 438 | William Monk of St. Mar-tin. 435 | William of Rusbrock. 439 |
| Roger Bacon a <i>Francif-can.</i> <i>ibid.</i> | St. Thomas Aquinas. 433 | Urban IV. <i>Pope.</i> 401 | William Prior of Affli-ghem. 436 | William of St. Amour. 476, 477 |
| S. | | W. | William <i>the Britain.</i> 428 | William of Sandwich. 437 |
| Sigehard Monk of St. Al-bans. 438 | | Walter of Constance. 426 | William of Bresse <i>Arch-bishop of Sens.</i> 439 | William of Segnelay. 426 |
| | | Walter Bishop of Poiti-ers. 435 | | William of Tripoly. 439 |

Of the *Fourteenth* Century.

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| A. | Benedict XII. <i>Pope.</i> <i>ibid.</i> | E. | H. | John Abbot of St. Bavon. 537 |
| A Cindynus, <i>see Grego-ry Acindynus.</i> 539 | Benedict XIII. <i>Pope.</i> 511 | Eberardus, <i>Archdeacon of Ratisbonne.</i> 518 | Haito, or Aito a <i>Canon Regular of the Premon-stratenses.</i> 518 | John a <i>Benedictine Monk of Castel.</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Adam Goddam, or Wod-dam, a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 531 | Berengarius of Fridol <i>Car-dinal.</i> 521 | Eckard a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 535 565 | Henry a <i>Monk of Rebdor-fe.</i> 531 | John d'Alie a <i>Carmelite.</i> 535 |
| Aito, <i>see Haito.</i> | Bernard Abbot of Mount-Cassin. 530 | Engelbert Abbot of Ad-mont. 517 | Henry Andernac a <i>Carme-lite.</i> 537 | Joannes Andreæ a <i>Lawyer.</i> 529 |
| Albericus Rosatus, or Roxiati, a <i>Lawyer.</i> 530 | Bernard Guidonis Bi-shop of Tuy, and after of Lodere. 525 | F. | Henry de Palmâ or de Baume, a <i>Grey Friar.</i> 535 | John Bacon, or Bacon-thorp a <i>Carmelite.</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Albert de Bresse a <i>Friar Preacher.</i> 536 | Bernardo de Parenzo a <i>Fri-ar-Preccher.</i> 536 | Fortanarius Vassalli <i>Car-dinal.</i> 536 | Henry Boich a <i>Lawyer.</i> 533 | John Balistaris of the same Order. 536 |
| Albert of Padua an <i>Augu-stine Hermit.</i> 522 | Bertamus of the same Or-der. 537 | Francis Martin a <i>Carme-lite.</i> 536 | Henry de Carret Bishop of Lucca. 522 | John Bassolis a <i>Grey-Fri-ar.</i> 522 |
| Albert of Strasburg. 532 | Bertrandus de Turre <i>Cardi-nal.</i> 526 | Franciscus Mayronius a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 526 | Henry de Dolendorp, a <i>Carmelite.</i> 536 | Joannes Becanus of U-trecht. 529 |
| Alexander of Alexandria, a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 535 | Bertrandus de Trille a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 535 | Francis Petrarch a <i>Lawyer</i> 529 | Henry D'Erford a <i>Ger-man.</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Jon. Blomendal a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 536 |
| Alexander de St. Elpidio, <i>Archbishop of Ravenna.</i> 523 | Blafius Andernarius a <i>Carmelite.</i> 537 | Franciscus Ximenius Bi-shop of Elna or Perpignan. 534 | Henry Euta or Oyta, a <i>German.</i> 537 | John de Burgo <i>Chancel-lor of Cambridge.</i> 533 |
| Alphonfus Vargas <i>Arch-bishop of Sevil.</i> 531 | Bonaventure of Padua a <i>Carmelite.</i> 533 | Francis Zabarell <i>Cardi-nal.</i> 535 | Henry de Kalkar a <i>Car-thusan</i> <i>ibid</i> | John Brammart a <i>Carme-lite.</i> 536 |
| Alvarus Pelagius Bishop of Silves. 523 | Boniface VIII. <i>Pope.</i> 488 | G. | Henry Knighton a <i>Canon Regular.</i> 533 | John Bromiard a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 534 |
| Andrew of New-Castle a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 518 | Boniface IX. <i>Pope.</i> 511 | Gallus Abbot of Konigfa-al. 531 | Henry Stero a <i>Benedic-tin Monk of Altaick.</i> 518 | John Calderin a <i>Lawyer.</i> 531 |
| Andronicus Senior the Greek Emperor. 537 542 | St. Bridget. 531 seq. 568 | Gerhard Bishop of Savon-na. 536 | Henry de Urimaria an <i>an Augustine Hermit.</i> 528 | Jon. de Campsen a <i>Carme-lite.</i> 537 |
| Anonymous or a Nameless Author 492 | C | Gerhard de Bononia a <i>Carmelite.</i> 535 | Herenus de Boye a <i>Carme-lito.</i> 535 | John Canon a <i>Grey-Friar</i> 529 |
| Antonius Andreas a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 521 | Callistus Patriarch of Con-stantinople. 542 | Gerhard Groot, or the Great, a <i>Canon Regular</i> 533 568 | Herman de Schilde an <i>Augu-stine Hermit.</i> 536 | Joannes Cantacuzenus the Greek Emperor, 537, 539, 542 |
| Antonius de Butrio a <i>Lawyer.</i> 534 | Cantacuzenus, <i>see John Cantacuzenus</i> | Gerhardus Odonis a <i>Grey Friar.</i> 530 | Hervæus Natalis a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 521 | John Cyparissiotia a <i>Greek.</i> 542 |
| Arnoldus Cescomes <i>Arch-bishop of Tarragon.</i> 528 | St. Catharine of Sienna. 532 | Gerhard of Sienna an <i>Augu-stine Hermit.</i> 536 | Hugolinus Malebranchi-us <i>Archbishop of Arimi-num.</i> 531 | John Duns, <i>firmamed Sco-tus, a Grey-Friar.</i> 519 |
| Arnoldus Terrenâ <i>Sacrist of Perpignan.</i> 525 | Clement V. <i>Pope.</i> 499 501 504 568 | Gerhard of Zurphen a <i>Canon Regular.</i> 533 | Hugh de Prato, a <i>Friar-Preccher.</i> 522 | John Erford of the same Order. 536 |
| Astefanus a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 526 | Clement VI. <i>Pope.</i> 506 | Giles Colonnior of Rome <i>Archbishop of Bourges.</i> 520 | J. | John of Friburg, <i>firmamed Runfic, Bishop of Of-ma.</i> 520 |
| Augustine D'Ascoli an <i>Augustine Hermit.</i> 533 | Clement VII. 509 511 | Gregory XI. <i>Pope.</i> 507 | Jacobus de Benedictis a <i>Grey Friar.</i> 519 | John Fustgin de Creutz-nac a <i>Carmelite.</i> 536 |
| Augustinus Triumphus of the same Order. 522 | Clement of Florence a <i>Ser-vite.</i> 528 | Gregory XII. <i>Pope.</i> 514 516 | Jacobus Cajetanus <i>Cardi-nal.</i> 518 | Joannes de St. Geminiano 519 |
| B. | Conradus Canon of Ratis-bonne, 537 | Gregory Acindynus a <i>Greek Monk.</i> 539 540 | Jacobus Folquier an <i>Augu-stine Hermit.</i> 530 | John Gluel a <i>Carmelite.</i> 537 |
| Baldus or Ubaldus a <i>Law-yer.</i> 535 | Conradus of Altzey. 536 | Gregorius Palamas <i>Arch-bishop of Thessalonica.</i> 539 &c. | Jacobus Magnus of the same Order. 535 | Joannes Golenius of the same Order. 536 |
| Barlaam Bishop of Hieraci-um. 538 539 540 | D. | Gregorius Ariminensis an <i>Augustine Hermit, Bishop of Ferrara.</i> 531 | Jacobus de Alta Villâ a <i>Germ.</i> 536 | Joannes Grossius of the same Order. 535 |
| Bartholomew Bishop of Urban. 528 | Daniel de Trevifi a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 528 | Guy Abbot of St. Denys. 526 | Jacobus de Laufannâ a <i>Preaching Friar.</i> 522 | John de Helden Knight, <i>Hospitalier of St. John of Jerusalem.</i> 537 |
| Bartholomew a <i>Grey-Fri-ar.</i> 538 | Demetrius Cydonius a <i>Greek.</i> 543 | Guy d'Eureux a <i>Preach-ing Friar.</i> 533 | Jacobus de Teramo <i>Arch-deacon of Averla.</i> 533 | Jon. Hildesheim a <i>Carme-lite.</i> 536 |
| Bartholomew Albicius of the same Order. 528 | Dinus de Mugello a <i>Law-yer.</i> 517 | Guy Bishop of Ferrara. 535 | Jacobus de Termes Abbot of Charlieu. 521 | Joannes Honsenius or Hoxemimius, <i>Canon of Liege.</i> 530 |
| Bartholomew de St. Con-cordiâ a <i>Friar-Preccher</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Dominicus Grenierius Bi-shop of Pamiez. 522 | Guy de Montrocher, a <i>French Divine.</i> 528 | Jacobus de Viterbo <i>Arch-bishop of Naples.</i> 535 | Joannes de Janduno or John of Gaunt, or Laon. 525, 565 |
| Bartholomew de Glanvil-le, a <i>Grey Friar.</i> 531 | Durandus of Champeigne a <i>Grey-Friar.</i> 528 | Guy de Terrenâ Bishop of Elna, or Perpignan. 525 | Idiota, <i>vid Raimondus Jordanus.</i> 507 | John Imanhusen a <i>Ger-man.</i> 536 |
| Benedict XI. <i>Pope.</i> 593 <i>ibid</i> 505 | Durandus de St. Porciano Bishop of Meaux. 505 517 526 | | Innocent VI. <i>Pope.</i> 514 | John de Joinville. 518 |
| | | | Innocent VII. <i>Pope.</i> 501 | John |
| | | | John XXI. <i>Pope.</i> 501 | |

An Alphabetical Table of the *Authors* Names.

John Malverne of Winchester. 531
John Lemoine surnamed Desfranches, Cardinal. 492
John of Naples a Friar-Precacher. 522
Joannes Oliva, vid. Petrus Joannes Oliva. 531
John d' Olney a Carthusian. 536
John of Paris a Canon Regular of St. Victor. 519
John of Paris a Friar-Precacher. 518
John de Regne a Carmelite. 535
Joannes de Rupe-Scissa. 536
Joannes Rasybrokius Prior of Wavre. 533
Joannes Saxo a Grey-Friar. 535
Joannes de Saxonia of the same Order. ibid.
John Schadland Bishop of Worms. 532
John de Schodehove a Carmelite. 537
Joannes Tacephalus a Carmelite. 536
John de Tambach a Friar-Precacher. 534
Joan. Thaulerus the same. 531
John Walsgram a Carmelite. 536
John de Werden a Grey-Friar. 537
Jordanus Saxo an Augustine Hermit. 532
Isaac Argyrus a Greek Monk. 542
Justus an Abbot of the Cistercians. 519

L.

Lapus de Chastillon, Abbot of St. Miniatus. 536
Leonarde de Gifton Cardinal. ibid.
Lucius Colutius Salutatus de Stignano a Lawyer. 534
Ludolphus or Landolphus Saxo a Carthusian. 528
Lupoldus or Ludolphus de Bamberg, a Lawyer. ib.

M.

Malachias a Grey-Friar. 521
Manuel Calecas a Greek Preaching-Friar. 540. 542
Mannul Palaeologus the Greek Emperor. 537. 543
Marinus Sanutus de Torfello. 523
Marsilius ab Inghen a Canon of St. Andrew of Coln. 533
Marsilius of Padua, called Menandrinus, a Lawyer. 524
Martin a Preaching-Friar. 535
Matthias or Matthew de Cracovia. 531
Matth. Blastares a Greek Monk. 541
Matt. d' Eureux a Preaching-Friar. 532
Matthew Florilegus a Benedictine Monk of Westminster. 531
Maximus a Greek Monk. 543
Maximus Planudes a great Monk. 541
Michael Angrianus or Aignan, a Carmelite. 535
Michael Casenas a Grey-Friar. 407. 525
Michael de Massa an Augustine Hermit. 536
Monaldus a Grey-Friar. 528

N.

Nicephorus Callistus a Greek Monk. 540
Nicephorus Gregorius Chartophylax of the Church of Constantinople. 542
Nicholas Cabasilas Archbishop of Thessalonica. ibid.
Nicholas Dorhin a Carmelite. 536
Nicholas Bymericus a Friar-preacher. 520
Nicholas Gorham of the same Order. 534
Nicholas Lyra a Grey-Friar. 526
Nicholas Oresmius or Orem Bishop of Lisieux. 532
Nicholas Ritzon a Carmelite. 536
Nicholas Trevech or Trevet a Friar-preacher. 522
Nilus Cabasilas Archbishop of Thessalonica. 541
Nilus Metrop. of Rhodes. 542
Nilus Damila a Greek Monk. 543

O.

Odericus de Port-naon a Grey-Friar. 526
Osbert a Carmelite. 536

P.

Palamas, see Gregory Palamas. 539

Paulus de Lyazares. 536
Paulus de Perusa a Carmelite. ibid.
Petrarch, see Francis Petrarch. 529
Philip Abbot of Otterburg. 537
Philip Bishop of Aichstat. 521
Philip Cabassolas Cardinal. 532
Philip de Ferieres Bishop of Badajoz. 537
Philip de Leydis Canon of Utrecht. 533
Philip de Meserius Knight. 525
Philip de Montcalier a Grey-Friar. 526
Philip Ribot a Carmelite. 533
Philotheus Patriarch of Constantinople. 540. 542.
Philotheus Achillinus, see Philip de Meziens. 525
Peter a Monk of Clara Vallis. 530
Petrus Aureolus Archbishop of Aix. 522
Peter de Auvergne Canon of Nostre-dame in Paris. ibid.
Peter Bercherius Prior of St. Eligius. 531
Peter Bertrand Cardinal. 507
Petrus Boherius Abbot of S. Aignan. 536
Petrus de Bosco Advocate of the French King. 491
Petrus de Casa Bishop of Vaiso. 536
Petrus de Dacia. 535
Peter de Harentals Abbot of Floreff. 505. 535
Peter John Oliva a Grey-Friar. 509. 564
Peter de Lunâ, see Benedict XIII. 511
Peter de Natalibus Bishop of Jeshol. 533
Petrus de Palude Patriarch of Jerusalem. 529
Petrus de Paternis an Hermit of S. Augustine. 530
Peter de Perpignan Cardinal. 535
Peter Quesnel a Grey-Friar. 533
Petrus Raimondus a Carmelite. 536
Petrus de Saxonia a Grey-Friar. 539
Peter Thomas a Carmelite. 536

Porcher de Salvaticis, see Victor Porcher. 521
Prothomax Lucensis Bishop of Torcello. ibid.

Q.

Quarantarius, see Francis Quarantarius. 529

R.

Radulphus or Ralph de Higden, or Hikeden, a Benedictine Monk of Chester. 531
Raimundus Jordanus, called Idiote, Abbot of Celles. 535
Raimundus Lullus a Grey-Friar. 517. 520
Rainerius de Pisâ a Preaching-Friar. 518
Ralph de Prælles a Master of Requests. 525
Ralph de Rivo Dean of Tongres. 534
Richard Fitz-Ralph Archbishop of Armagh. 530. 568
Richard de Hampole an Hermit of St. Augustine. 529
Richard de Lavinham a Carmelite. 537
Richard de Maydescon of the same Order. ibid.
Richard de Sienna a Cardinal. 495. 535
Robert a Carmelite. 536
Robert a Preaching-Friar. 535
Robert Conway a Grey-Friar. see Roger. 531
Robert Cownton of the same Order. 528
Robert Gervais Bishop of Senec. 532
Robert Holkot a Friar-Precacher. 524
Roger Choñoe or Conway. 531

S.

Sibertus de Beka a Carmelite. 535
Siffridus a Priest of Misnia. 518
Simon Baraston an Englishman. 528
Simon de Cremonâ an Augustine Hermit. 533
Simon Fidatus de Cassia of the same Order. 529
Simon de Spira a Carmelite. 536
Stephen Pettington a Carmelite. ibid.
Stephen of Provence a Lawyer. ibid.
Stephen de Salagnac a Preaching-Friar. 518

T.

Theophanes Archbishop of Nice. 542
Thomas Bradwardin A.B. of Canterbury. 530

Thomas Jorjial, or Joyeus, a Cardinal. 519
Thomas Lambe a Carmelite. 537
Thomas of Strasburg an Hermit of St. Augustine. 530
Thomas Stobbs or Stubbs a Friar-Precacher. 531
Thomas Wicke a Canon Regular of St. Augustine. 518
Tilman a Carmelite. 536

U.

Ubaldus, vide Baldus. 535
Ubertinus de Cassalis a Grey-Friar. 525
Victor Porcher de Salvaticis a Carthusian. 521
Vitalis de Furno a Cardinal. 522
Urbanus V. Pope. 507
Urbanus VI. Pope. 508

W.

Walter Burley a Grey-Friar. 529
Walter Diffe. 537
William de Baldensel or Boldefelc or de Boldensleve, a German Knight. 528
William Durandus Bishop of Menda. 492. 541
William de Kayott a Friar-Precacher. 536
William de Major Bishop of Angers. 521
Will. de Mandagot Cardinal. ibid.
William de Montedun Abbot of Monther-neuf. 528
William Mount Canon of Lincoln. 526
William de Nangis a Monk of St. Denys. 518
William of Nottingham Canon of York. 526
William Ockam a Grey-Friar. 517. 528
Will. Oppenbach a German. 537
William of Paris a Friar-Precacher. 518
William Rubion a Grey-Friar. 528
William Thorn a Benedictine Monk of Canterbury. 533
William de Wallingford, an Englishman. 536
William Wodford or Wilford, a Grey-Friar. 534

The end of the alphabetical Table of the ecclesiastical Authors of the fourteenth Age.

An Alphabetical TABLE of the Councils held in the *Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries.*

Of the *Seventh* and *Eighth* Centuries.

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|----|--------------------------------|----|
| A. | | Clove-shaw. | 29 | F. | |
| A Ix-la-Chappelle <i>against</i> Felix Or. | 46 | Compeigne | 31 | France. | 3 |
| Aquileia. | 45 | Constantinople III. | 16 | Frankfort. | 45 |
| Autun. | 19 | Constantinople <i>Quinifext.</i> | 23 | G. | |
| B. | | Constantinople <i>against</i> Images. | 32 | Germany. | 27 |
| Barkhamstead. | 26 | | | H. | |
| Braga. | 20 | E. | | Hereford. | 20 |
| C. | | Egara. | 1 | L. | |
| Challon II. | 1. 17 | England. | 1 | Lateran <i>under</i> Martin I. | 8 |
| | | | | Lestines. | |

An Alphabetical Table of the Councils, &c.

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--------|------------------------|-------|------------|-------|
| Lestines. | | 27 | Rome under Leo III. | 46 | —XI. | 20 |
| Merida. | M. | 19 | Saragossa. | 22 | —XII. | 21 |
| Metz. | | 31 | Sevil. | 3 | —XIII. | 22 |
| | N. | | Soissons. | 28 | —XIV. | ibid. |
| Nice. | | 32 | | | —XV. | ibid. |
| Northumberland, two | | 19. 44 | Toledo under Gondemar. | 1 | —XVI. | ibid. |
| | P. | | Toledo IV. | 4 | —XVII. | 22 |
| Paris, two | | 2 | —V. | | | |
| | R. | | —VI. | 7 | Verberic. | 30 |
| Ratisbone. | | 45 | —VII. | ibid. | Verneuil. | 31 |
| Rheims. | | 4 | —VIII. | ibid. | | |
| Rome under Gregory II. | | 27 | —IX. | 17 | Worcester. | 1 |
| Rome under Zachary, two | | 28 | —X. | 18 | | |

Of the Ninth Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|------------------------------|-------|-------|-----------------|---------|-------|--------------|------------------|-------|
| A Aix-la-chapelle. | 105. | 809 | Langres. | 58. | 859 | Rheims. | ibid. | 874 |
| Aix-la-chapelle. | 107. | 816 | Lyons. | 108. | 829 | Rome. | 113. | 826 |
| Aix-la-chapelle. | ibid. | 817 | Lyons. | 121. | 836 | Rome. | ibid. | 853 |
| Aix-la-chapelle. | 109. | 836 | Lyons. | 126. | 845 | Rome. | 91. | 862 |
| Aix-la-chapelle. | 73. | 860 | | | | Rome. | 74. | 863 |
| Aix-la-chapelle. | ibid. | 862 | Mentz. | 106. | 813 | Rome. | 91. | 864 |
| Arles VI. | 105. | 813 | Mentz. | 108. | 829 | Rome. | 61. | 865 |
| Attigny. | 124. | 822 | Mentz. | 111. | 847 | Rome. | 98. | 879 |
| Attigny. | 111. | 854 | Mentz. | 53. | 848 | Savonieres. | 58, 114. | 859 |
| Attigny. | 68. | 870 | Mentz. | 117. | 888 | Senlis. | 60. | 863 |
| | | | Meaux. | 109. | 845 | Sens. | 58. | 853 |
| Beauvais. | 109. | 845 | Mets. | 114. | 859 | Soissons. | 60, 57, 63, 113. | 853 |
| Bonneval. | 110. | 856 | Mets. | 74, 75. | 863 | Soissons. | 67. | 866 |
| | | | Mets. | 118. | 869 | Soissons. | ibid. | 867 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Celichith. | 107. | 816 | Nantes, forged. | 119. | 895 | Thionville. | 107. | 821 |
| Chalons II. | 106. | 813 | Noion. | 130. | 831 | Thionville. | 60, 65, 121. | 835 |
| Coblentz. | 115. | 860 | | | | Thionville. | 109. | 844 |
| Cologne. | 117. | 887 | Paris. | 47. | 824 | Thouloufe. | 108. | 829 |
| Compeigne. | 121. | 833 | Paris VI. | 108. | 829 | Thouloufe. | 110. | 843 |
| Compeigne. | 111. | 866 | Paris. | 121. | 838 | Toul I. | 115. | 860 |
| Constantinople. | 49. | 805 | Pavia. | 109. | 846 | Tours II. | 106. | 813 |
| Constantinople. | 51. | 809 | Pavia. | 112. | 850 | Touffi. | 53. | 863 |
| Constantinople. | 48. | 842 | Pavia. | 111. | 876 | Treves. | 19. | 845 |
| Constantinople. | 89. | 859 | Pista. | ibid. | 862 | Tribur. | 65. | 895 |
| Constantinople. | 90. | 861 | Piste. | 67. | 869 | Troyes. | 72. | 867 |
| Constantinople. | 91. | 866 | Pontignon. | 76. | 876 | Troyes. | 117. | 878 |
| Constantinople VIII. general | 92. | 869 | | | | | | |
| Constantinople. | 98. | 879 | Quiercy. | 53. | 848 | Valence III. | 58, 60, 114. | 855 |
| Coulein Assembly. | 101. | 843 | Quiercy. | 57. | 853 | Verbery. | 113. | 853 |
| | | | Quiercy. | 110. | 857 | Verbery. | 67. | 869 |
| Douzy I. | 71. | 871 | Quiercy. | 114. | 858 | Verneuil. | 109. | 844 |
| Douzy II. | 116. | 874 | Quiercy. | 111. | 877 | Vienna. | 118. | 892 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Epernay. | 110. | 846 | Ravenna. | 116. | 877 | Wormes. | 108. | 822 |
| Fismes. | 117. | 881 | Rheims. | 106. | 813 | Wormes. | 115. | 898 |
| | | | Rheims. | 75. | 842 | | | |
| Ingelheim. | 108. | 826 | Rheims. | ibid. | 857 | | | |

Of the Tenth Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------|--------------------------|-----------|-------|
| A Aix-la-chapelle. | 181. | 1003 | Ingelheim. | 174. | 972 | Rome. | ibid. | 963 |
| Augsburg. | 188. | 952 | London. | 189. | 948 | Rome. | 160. | 964 |
| | | | | | | Rome. | ibid. | ibid. |
| Canterbury. | 188. | 904 | Meaux. | 175. | 961 | Rome. | 184, 192. | 985 |
| Canterbury under St. Dunstan, | 190. | 974 | St. Mary's Mount. | ibid. | 972 | Rome under Sylvestre II. | 181. | 998 |
| Charroux. | 180. | 989 | Mouzon. | 174. | 948 | | ibid. | 1002 |
| Chateau-Thierry. | 174. | 934 | Mouzon. | 175. | ibid. | Senlis. | 175. | 989 |
| Cher River. | ibid. | 947 | Mouzon. | 178. | 995 | Soissons. | 174. | 941 |
| Coblentz. | 188. | 922 | | | | | | |
| Constantinople. | 154. | 920 | Poitiers. | 180. | 999 | Thierry-Chateau. | 174. | 934 |
| Constantinople. | ibid. | 944 | | | | St. Thierry. | 175. | 953 |
| Constantinople. | ibid. | 967 | Ravenna. | 157, 163. | 904 | Trier, or Treves. | ibid. | 948 |
| | | | Ravenna. | 161. | 967 | Trosly. | 173. | 909 |
| S. Denis. | 182. | 995 | Ravenna. | 180. | 997 | Trosly. | ibid. | 921 |
| | | | Rheims. | 174. | 923 | Trosly. | ibid. | 924 |
| Erfurdt. | 188. | 932 | Rheims. | 176. | 975 | Trosly. | ibid. | 927 |
| England under K. Edmund. | 189. | 944 | Rheims. | ibid. | 989 | | | |
| England general. | 190. | 973 | Rheims. | ibid. | 992 | Verdun. | 174. | 947 |
| | | | Rheims. | 178. | 993 | | | |
| Fismes. | 174. | 948 | Rome. | 177. | 995 | Winchester. | 190. | 975. |
| | | | Rome. | 157, 163. | 904 | | | |
| Ingelheim. | 174. | 948 | Rome. | 159. | 949 | | | |

Of

An Alphabetical Table of the Councils, &c.

Of the *Eleventh* Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|---|-----------------------|-------|---|-----------------------|-------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| A. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England, | 262. | 1010 | Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | Rome, | 197 and 207. | 1050 |
| Aquitaine Prov. | 255. | 1040 | Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | Rome, | 207. | 1051 |
| Arras, | 253. | 1025 | Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1053 |
| Avignon, | 225. | 1080 | Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | Rome, | 208. | 1057 |
| Autun, | 219, 224, and | 226. | Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1059 |
| Autun, | 223. | 1094 | London, | 262. | 1075 | Rome, | 209. | 1063 |
| B. | | | | | | | | |
| Bari, | 234 and 243. | 1098 | London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1065 |
| Benevento, | 208. | 1059 | London, | 263. | 1108 | Rome, the same Year | <i>ibid.</i> | 1065 |
| Benevento, | 231. | 1087 | M. | | | Rome, | 212. | 1074 |
| Benevento, | 232. | 1091 | Mantua, | 207. | 1052 | Rome, | 213. | 1075 |
| Berchach or Goslar Assembly. | 218. | 1085 | Mantua, | 209. | 1064 | Rome, | 214. | 1076 |
| Bordeaux, | 199. | 1080 | Mentz, | 250. | 1079 | Rome, | 216. | 1078 |
| Bourges, | 254. | 1031 | Mentz, | 261. | 1069 | Rome the same Year, | 199, 216. | 1078 |
| Brescia, | 199. | 1080 | Mentz, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1071 | Rome, | 199, 217. | 1079 |
| Brionne, | 197. | 1050 | Mentz Assembly, | 217. | 1080 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1080 |
| Burgundy Prov. | 255. | 1040 | Mentz Assembly, | 219. | 1085 | Rome, | 218. | 1083 |
| C. | | | | | | | | |
| Capua, | 231. | 1087 | Meaux, | 225. | 1080 | Rome, | 232. | 1089 |
| Clermont, | 224. | 1077 | Meaux, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1082 | Rome, | 271. | 1098 |
| Clermont, | 225 and 233. | 1095 | Melfi, | 208. | 1089 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1099 |
| Compeigne, | 205. | 1000 | Melfi, | 232, | 1089 | Rouen or Roan, | 259. | 1050 |
| Constance, | 232. | 1094 | N. | | | Rouen, | 198 and 559. | 1063 |
| Coyaco, | 263. | 1050 | Narbonne, | 261. | 1054 | Rouen, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1072 |
| D. | | | | | | | | |
| Dijon, | 224. | 1077 | Nismes, | 234. | 1096 | Rouen, | 260. | 1074 |
| Dortmund in Westphalia, | 261. | 1005 | O. | | | Rouen, | 234. | 1096 |
| E. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | Oppenheim Assembly or Tribur, | 215. | 1076 | S. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | Orleans, | 255. | 1017 | Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | P. | | | Siponto, | 207. | 1050 |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | Paris, | 197. | 1050 | Soissons, | 258. | 1092 |
| F. | | | | | | | | |
| Florence, | 183 and 207. | 1055 | Pavia under Pope Benedict VIII. between | p. 206. y. 1014, 1024 | | T. | | |
| Forcheim Assembly, | 216. | 1006 | the Years, | 207. | 1049 | Toulouse, | 260. | 1056 |
| Frankfort, | 205. | 1006 | Pavia, | 199, 233. | 1095 | Toulouse, | 232. | 1090 |
| G. | | | | | | | | |
| Goslar or Berchach Assembly, | 218. | 1085 | Placentia, | 227. | 1074 | Tours, | 198, 208. | 1055 |
| L. | | | | | | | | |
| Leon, | 263. | 1012 | Poitiers, | 227. | 1074 | Tours, | 258. | 1060 |
| Lillebonne, | 260. | 1080 | Poitiers, | 192. | 1075 | Tours, | 234. | 1096 |
| Limoges, | 254. | 1031 | Poitiers, | 224. | 1078 | Tribur or Oppenheim Assembly, | 215. | 1076 |
| H. | | | | | | | | |
| Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | Quintilineburg Assembly, | 218, | 1085 | Troia in Apulia, | 234. | 1093 |
| Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | Q. | | | V. | | |
| Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Rheims, | 202, 207 and 255. | 1049 | Vercell, | 197. | 1050 |
| Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | Rheims, | 232. | 1092 | W. | | |
| Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Rome, | 206. | 1046 | Winchester | 201. | 1071 |
| London, | 262. | 1075 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1047 | Winchester | 262. | 1076 |
| London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | Rome, | 207. | 1049 | Windsor, | 200. | 1070 |
| London, | 263. | 1108 | R. | | | Worms Assembly, | 243. | 1076 |
| I. | | | | | | | | |
| Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | S. | | | X. | | |
| Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | Narbonne, | 261. | 1054 | Y. | | |
| Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Nismes, | 234. | 1096 | Z. | | |
| Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | O. | | | A. | | |
| Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Oppenheim Assembly or Tribur, | 215. | 1076 | B. | | |
| London, | 262. | 1075 | Orleans, | 255. | 1017 | C. | | |
| London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | P. | | | D. | | |
| London, | 263. | 1108 | Paris, | 197. | 1050 | E. | | |
| J. | | | | | | | | |
| Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | Pavia under Pope Benedict VIII. between | p. 206. y. 1014, 1024 | | F. | | |
| Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | the Years, | 207. | 1049 | G. | | |
| Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Pavia, | 199, 233. | 1095 | H. | | |
| Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | Placentia, | 227. | 1074 | I. | | |
| Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Poitiers, | 227. | 1074 | K. | | |
| London, | 262. | 1075 | Poitiers, | 192. | 1075 | L. | | |
| London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | Poitiers, | 224. | 1078 | M. | | |
| London, | 263. | 1108 | Q. | | | N. | | |
| K. | | | | | | | | |
| Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | Quintilineburg Assembly, | 218, | 1085 | O. | | |
| Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | R. | | | P. | | |
| Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Rheims, | 202, 207 and 255. | 1049 | Q. | | |
| Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | Rheims, | 232. | 1092 | R. | | |
| Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Rome, | 206. | 1046 | S. | | |
| London, | 262. | 1075 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1047 | T. | | |
| London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | Rome, | 207. | 1049 | U. | | |
| London, | 263. | 1108 | S. | | | V. | | |
| L. | | | | | | | | |
| Limoges, | 255. | 1095 | T. | | | W. | | |
| Lyonnois Prov. | 208. | 1040 | Narbonne, | 261. | 1054 | X. | | |
| Lyons, | 225. | 1055 | Nismes, | 234. | 1096 | Y. | | |
| Lyons, | 255, &c. | 1080 | O. | | | Z. | | |
| Lisieux, | 259. | 1055 | Oppenheim Assembly or Tribur, | 215. | 1076 | A. | | |
| London, | 262. | 1075 | Orleans, | 255. | 1017 | B. | | |
| London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | P. | | | C. | | |
| London, | 263. | 1108 | Paris, | 197. | 1050 | D. | | |
| M. | | | | | | | | |
| Mantua, | 207. | 1052 | Pavia under Pope Benedict VIII. between | p. 206. y. 1014, 1024 | | E. | | |
| Mantua, | 209. | 1064 | the Years, | 207. | 1049 | F. | | |
| Mentz, | 250. | 1079 | Pavia, | 199, 233. | 1095 | G. | | |
| Mentz, | 261. | 1069 | Placentia, | 227. | 1074 | H. | | |
| Mentz, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1071 | Poitiers, | 227. | 1074 | I. | | |
| Mentz Assembly, | 217. | 1080 | Poitiers, | 192. | 1075 | K. | | |
| Mentz Assembly, | 219. | 1085 | Poitiers, | 224. | 1078 | L. | | |
| Meaux, | 225. | 1080 | Q. | | | M. | | |
| Meaux, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1082 | Quintilineburg Assembly, | 218, | 1085 | N. | | |
| Melfi, | 208. | 1089 | R. | | | O. | | |
| Melfi, | 232, | 1089 | Rheims, | 202, 207 and 255. | 1049 | P. | | |
| N. | | | | | | | | |
| Narbonne, | 261. | 1054 | Rheims, | 232. | 1092 | Q. | | |
| Nismes, | 234. | 1096 | Rome, | 206. | 1046 | R. | | |
| O. | | | | | | | | |
| Oppenheim Assembly or Tribur, | 215. | 1076 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1047 | S. | | |
| Tribur, | 215. | 1076 | Rome, | 207. | 1049 | T. | | |
| Orleans, | 255. | 1017 | S. | | | U. | | |
| P. | | | | | | | | |
| Paris, | 197. | 1050 | Quintilineburg Assembly, | 218, | 1085 | V. | | |
| Pavia under Pope Benedict VIII. between | p. 206. y. 1014, 1024 | | R. | | | W. | | |
| the Years, | 207. | 1049 | Rheims, | 202, 207 and 255. | 1049 | X. | | |
| Pavia, | 207. | 1049 | Rheims, | 232. | 1092 | Y. | | |
| Placentia, | 199, 233. | 1095 | Rome, | 206. | 1046 | Z. | | |
| Poitiers, | 227. | 1074 | Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1047 | A. | | |
| Poitiers, | 192. | 1075 | Rome, | 207. | 1049 | B. | | |
| Poitiers, | 224. | 1078 | S. | | | C. | | |
| Q. | | | | | | | | |
| Quintilineburg Assembly, | 218, | 1085 | T. | | | D. | | |
| R. | | | | | | | | |
| Rheims, | 202, 207 and 255. | 1049 | U. | | | E. | | |
| Rheims, | 232. | 1092 | V. | | | F. | | |
| Rome, | 206. | 1046 | W. | | | G. | | |
| Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1047 | X. | | | H. | | |
| Rome, | 207. | 1049 | Y. | | | I. | | |
| S. | | | | | | | | |
| Rome, | 1255. | 1095 | Z. | | | K. | | |
| Rome, | 208. | 1040 | A. | | | L. | | |
| Rome, | 225. | 1055 | B. | | | M. | | |
| Rome, | 255, &c. | 1080 | C. | | | N. | | |
| Rome, | 259. | 1055 | D. | | | O. | | |
| Rome, | 262. | 1075 | E. | | | P. | | |
| Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1102 | F. | | | Q. | | |
| Rome, | 263. | 1108 | G. | | | R. | | |
| Rome, the same Year | <i>ibid.</i> | 1065 | H. | | | S. | | |
| Rome, | 212. | 1074 | I. | | | T. | | |
| Rome, | 213. | 1075 | K. | | | U. | | |
| Rome, | 214. | 1076 | L. | | | V. | | |
| Rome, | 216. | 1078 | M. | | | W. | | |
| Rome the same Year, | 199, 216. | 1078 | N. | | | X. | | |
| Rome, | 199, 217. | 1079 | O. | | | Y. | | |
| Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1080 | P. | | | Z. | | |
| Rome, | 218. | 1083 | Q. | | | A. | | |
| Rome, | 232. | 1089 | R. | | | B. | | |
| Rome, | 271. | 1098 | S. | | | C. | | |
| Rome, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1099 | T. | | | D. | | |
| Rouen or Roan, | 259. | 1050 | U. | | | E. | | |
| Rouen, | 198 and 559. | 1063 | V. | | | F. | | |
| Rouen, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1072 | W. | | | G. | | |
| Rouen, | 260. | 1074 | X. | | | H. | | |
| Rouen, | 234. | 1096 | Y. | | | I. | | |
| T. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | Z. | | | K. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | A. | | | L. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | B. | | | M. | | |
| U. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | C. | | | N. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | D. | | | O. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | E. | | | P. | | |
| V. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | F. | | | Q. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | G. | | | R. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | H. | | | S. | | |
| W. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | I. | | | T. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | K. | | | U. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | L. | | | V. | | |
| X. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | M. | | | W. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | N. | | | X. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | O. | | | Y. | | |
| Y. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | P. | | | Z. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | Q. | | | A. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | R. | | | B. | | |
| Z. | | | | | | | | |
| Selingenstadt, | 261. | 1023 | S. | | | C. | | |
| Siponto, | 207. | 1050 | T. | | | D. | | |
| Soissons, | 258. | 1092 | U. | | | E. | | |
| A. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England, | 262. | 1010 | V. | | | F. | | |
| Aquitaine Prov. | 255. | 1040 | W. | | | G. | | |
| Arras, | 253. | 1025 | X. | | | H. | | |
| Avignon, | 225. | 1080 | Y. | | | I. | | |
| Autun, | 219, 224, and | 226. | Z. | | | K. | | |
| Autun, | 223. | 1094 | A. | | | L. | | |
| B. | | | | | | | | |
| Bari, | 234 and 243. | 1098 | B. | | | M. | | |
| Benevento, | 208. | 1059 | C. | | | N. | | |
| Benevento, | 231. | 1087 | D. | | | O. | | |
| Benevento, | 232. | 1091 | E. | | | P. | | |
| Berchach or Goslar Assembly. | 218. | 1085 | F. | | | Q. | | |
| Bordeaux, | 199. | 1080 | G. | | | R. | | |
| Bourges, | 254. | 1031 | H. | | | S. | | |
| Brescia, | 199. | 1080 | I. | | | T. | | |
| Brionne, | 197. | 1050 | K. | | | U. | | |
| Burgundy Prov. | 255. | 1040 | L. | | | V. | | |
| C. | | | | | | | | |
| Capua, | 231. | 1087 | M. | | | W. | | |
| Clermont, | 224. | 1077 | N. | | | X. | | |
| Clermont, | 225 and 233. | 1095 | O. | | | Y. | | |
| Compeigne, | 205. | 1000 | P. | | | Z. | | |
| Constance, | 232. | 1094 | Q. | | | A. | | |
| Coyaco, | 263. | 1050 | R. | | | B. | | |
| D. | | | | | | | | |
| Dijon, | 224. | 1077 | S. | | | C. | | |
| Dortmund in Westphalia, | 261. | 1005 | T. | | | D. | | |
| E. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | U. | | | E. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | V. | | | F. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | W. | | | G. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | X. | | | H. | | |
| F. | | | | | | | | |
| Florence, | 183 and 207. | 1055 | Y. | | | I. | | |
| Forcheim Assembly, | 216. | 1006 | Z. | | | K. | | |
| Frankfort, | 205. | 1006 | A. | | | L. | | |
| G. | | | | | | | | |
| Goslar or Berchach Assembly, | 218. | 1085 | B. | | | M. | | |
| H. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | C. | | | N. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | D. | | | O. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | E. | | | P. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | F. | | | Q. | | |
| I. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | G. | | | R. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | H. | | | S. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | I. | | | T. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | K. | | | U. | | |
| J. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | L. | | | V. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | M. | | | W. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | N. | | | X. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | O. | | | Y. | | |
| K. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | P. | | | Z. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | Q. | | | A. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | R. | | | B. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | S. | | | C. | | |
| L. | | | | | | | | |
| Enham in England | 262. | 1010 | T. | | | D. | | |
| Elna, | 264. | 1065 | U. | | | E. | | |
| Erford, | 262. | 1073 | V. | | | F. | | |
| Erford, | 212. | 1074 | W. | | | G. | | |
| M. | | | | | | | | |
| Mantua, | 207. | 1052 | X. | | | H. | | |
| Mantua, | 209. | 1064 | Y. | | | I. | | |
| Mentz, | 250. | 1079 | Z. | | | K. | | |
| Mentz, | 261. | 1069 | A. | | | L. | | |
| Mentz, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1071 | B. | | | M. | | |
| Mentz Assembly, | 217. | 1080 | C. | | | N. | | |
| Mentz Assembly, | 219. | 1085 | D. | | | | | |

Of the *Twelfth* Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|----------------|-----------|-------|----------------------|--------------|-------|-----------|---------------------|-------|
| A. | | | | | | | | |
| A Nfe, | 391. | 1100 | Later. I. General, | 285. | 1123 | Rheims, | 283. | 1119 |
| Avignon, | 332. | 1162 | Later. II. General, | 289, 388. | 1139 | Rheims, | 288, 392. | 1131 |
| Auranches, | 393. | 1172 | Later. III. General, | 389. | 1179 | Rheims, | <i>ibid.</i> 292. | 1148 |
| Auxerre, | 292, 329. | 1147 | Liege, | 288, 291. | 1131 | Rome, | 279. | 1102 |
| B. | | | | | | | | |
| Beaugency, | 272, 391. | 1104 | Lodi, | 331. | 1161 | S. | | |
| Beauvais, | 282, 392. | 1114 | Lombes, | 320. | 1176 | Sens, | 292, 299, 304, 325. | 1140 |
| Beauvais, | 331, 353. | 1161 | London, | 392. | 1125 | Sens, | 361. | 1163 |
| C. | | | | | | | | |
| Cassel in Ire. | 393. | 1172 | London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1127 | Sens, | 321. | 1198 |
| Chalons, | 282. | 1115 | London, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1138 | Soissons, | 322. | 1121 |
| Chartres, | 304, 317. | 1146 | London, | 394. | 1175 | T. | | |
| Clarendon. | 336. | 1164 | M. | | | Tornus, | 287. | 1115 |
| Colen, | 282. | 1115. | Mentz, | 280. | 1105 | Toulouse, | 320. | 1119 |
| E. | | | | | | | | |
| Etampes, | 270. | 1100 | Mentz, | <i>ibid.</i> | 1107 | Toulouse, | 331. | 1164 |
| Etampes, | 288, 291. | 1130 | Montpellier, | 295. | 1195 | Tours, | 320. | 1163 |
| Etampes, | 292. | 1147 | N. | | | Trier, | 368. | 1148 |
| G. | | | | | | | | |
| Geinleheufen | 333. | 1186 | Nantes, | 443. | 1127 | Triburia, | 283. | 1119 |
| Gisors, | 338. | 1168 | Newmarket, | 331. | 1161 | Troyes, | 392. | 1104 |
| Guaftalla, | 280. | 1106 | Northampton. | 337. | 1164 | Troyes, | 274. | 1107 |
| I. | | | | | | | | |
| Jerusalem, | 282. | 1111 | Northausen, | 279. | 1105 | Troyes, | 291, 294, 310. | 1128 |
| Jouarre, | 289. | 1130 | O. | | | V. | | |
| Ireland, | 364. | 1110 | Oxford, | 320. | 1160 | Valence, | 391. | 1100 |
| L. | | | | | | | | |
| Lateran, | 281. | 1112 | Paris, | 391. | 1105 | Venice, | 333. | 1177 |
| Lateran, | 282, 375. | 1116 | Paris, | 292, 329. | 1147 | Vienna, | 283- | 1112 |
| M. | | | | | | | | |
| N. | | | | | | | | |
| O. | | | | | | | | |
| P. | | | | | | | | |
| Q. | | | | | | | | |
| R. | | | | | | | | |
| S. | | | | | | | | |
| T. | | | | | | | | |
| V. | | | | | | | | |
| W. | | | | | | | | |
| Y. | | | | | | | | |
| Z. | | | | | | | | |

An Alphabetical Table of the Councils, &c. Of the *Thirteenth* Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|----------------------|--------------|-------|
| A. | | | E. | | | | | |
| A ix la Chapelle. | 397. | 1227 | Exeter. | 473. | 1287 | Paris. | 484. | 1223 |
| Alby. | 461. | 1254 | | | | Paris. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1226 |
| Angers. | 465. | 1269 | L. | | | Poitiers. | 471. | 1280 |
| Angers. | 470. | 1279 | Lambeth. | 446. | 1206 | Poitiers. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1284 |
| Arles. | 457. | 1234 | Lambeth. | 463. | 1261 | Pontcau-de-Mer. | 469. | 1279 |
| Arles. | 462. | 1260 | Lambeth. | 471. | 1281 | | | |
| Arles. | 468. | 1275 | Langeis. | 427. | 1278 | Q. | | |
| Avignon. | 446. | 1209 | Lateran IV. <i>General.</i> | 448. | 1215 | Quentin. | 465. | 1271 |
| Avignon. | 465. | 1270 | Lavaur. | 484. | 1213 | | | |
| Avignon. | 469. | 1282 | Laval. | 461. | 1243 | R. | | |
| B. | | | Lions I. <i>General.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | 1245 | Ravenna. | 472. | 1286 |
| Beziers. | 457. | 1233 | Lions II. <i>General.</i> | 466. | 1274 | Reading. | 469. | 1279 |
| Beziers. | 461. | 1246 | Lisle in Provence. | 473. | 1288 | Rennes. | 466. | 1273 |
| Beziere. | 462. | 1255 | London. | 445. | 1200 | Rome. | 397. | 1210 |
| Bourdeaux. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1255 | London. | 462. | 1237 | Roan. | 475. | 1299 |
| Bourdeaux. | 463. | 1262 | London. | 464. | 1263 | Ruffec. | 462. | 1258 |
| Bourges. | 484. | 1225 | London. | 474. | 1291 | S. | | |
| Bourges. | 468. | 1276 | | | | Saintz. | 475. | 1298 |
| Bourges. | 472. | 1286 | M. | | | Saltzburg. | 467. | 1274 |
| Bourges. | 469. | 1279 | Melun. | 454. | 1216 | Saltzburg. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1281 |
| Buda. | | | Melun. | 485. | 1232 | Saltzburg. | 474. | 1291 |
| C. | | | Ments. | 455. | 1225 | Saumur. | 461. | 1253 |
| Canterbury. | 447. | 1295 | Merton. | 474. | 1300 | Saumur. | 468. | 1276 |
| Chateau-Gonthier. | 456. | 1231 | Montilly. | 483. | 1209 | Saumur. | 474. | 1294 |
| Chateau-Gonthier. | 465. | 1268 | Montpellier. | 448. | 1215 | Sens. | 445. | 1198 |
| Chichester. | 474. | 1289 | Montpellier. | 484. | 1224 | Sens. | 765. | 1269 |
| Chichester. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1292 | Montpellier. | 462. | 1258 | T. | | |
| Clermont. | 487. | 1263 | | | | Tholoufe. | 455. | 1229 |
| Cognac. | 459. | 1238 | N. | | | Tours. | 458. | 1236 |
| Cognac. | 463. | 1260 | Nantes. | 464. | 1264 | Tours. | 460. | 1239 |
| Cognac. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1262 | Narbonne. | 484. | 1207 | Tours. | 472. | 1282 |
| Cologn. | 462. | 1260 | Narbonne. | 455. | 1227 | V. | | |
| Cologn. | 464. | 1266 | Narbonne. | 462. | 1235 | Valence in Dauphine. | 461. | 1248 |
| Cologn. | 471. | 1280 | Nismes. | 472. | 1284 | Vienna in Austria. | 464. | 1267 |
| Cologn. | 471. | 1280 | Nogaro. | 474. | 1290 | W. | | |
| Compeign. | 465. | 1270 | Nimpha in Bithynia. | 440. | 1233 | Wirtzburg. | 379. | 1209 |
| Constantinople. | 442. | 1277 | | | | Wirtzburg. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1222 |
| Constantinople. | 443. | 1284 | O. | | | Wirtzburg. | 473. | 1287 |
| D. | | | Oxford. | 454. | 1222 | | | |
| Dalmatia. | 445. | 1199 | P. | | | | | |
| Durham. | 468. | 1276 | Paris. | 480. | 1209 | | | |
| | | | Paris. | 447. | 1212 | | | |

Of the *Fourteenth* Century.

| Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. | Place. | Page. | Year. |
|------------------|--------------|-------|---------------|--------------|-------|---------------------|--------------|-------|
| A. | | | M. | | | R. | | |
| A ngers. | 552. | 1365 | London. | 498. | 1310 | Pifa. | 515. | 1408 |
| Avignon. | 549. | 1326 | London. | 553. | 1321 | Pennafiel. | 550. | 1302 |
| Avignon. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1337 | London. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1328 | Presburg. | 544. | 1309 |
| Aufche. | 543. | 1300 | London. | 554. | 1341 | | | |
| Aufche. | 544. | 1308 | London. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1342 | Ravenna. | 498. | 1310 |
| B. | | | London. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1343 | Ravenna. | 546. | 1311 |
| Bayeux. | 543. | 1300 | London. | 534. | 1382 | Ravenna. | 547. | 1314 |
| Beziere. | 552. | 1351 | London. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1391 | Ravenna. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1317 |
| Bourges. | 551. | 1336 | London. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1396 | Roan. | 561. | 1325 |
| C. | | | | | | Ruffec. | 560. | 1327 |
| Chateaugonthier. | 551. | 1336 | M. | | | S. | | |
| Colen. | 543. | 1300 | Macclesfield. | 554. | 1332 | Salamanca. | 498. | 1310 |
| Colen. | 545. | 1310 | Macclesfield. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1362 | Salamanca. | 561. | 1335 |
| Colen. | 549. | 1322 | Marfiac. | 550. | 1326 | Saltzburg. | 545. | 1310 |
| Compeigne. | 544. | 1301 | Marfiac. | 551. | 1330 | Saltzburg. | 553. | 1386 |
| Compeigne. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1304 | Melun. | 543. | 1300 | Saumur. | 548. | 1315 |
| Compeigne. | 551. | 1329 | | | | Senlis. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1316 |
| Complutum. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1326 | N. | | | Senlis. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1317 |
| Complutum. | 552. | 1347 | Narbonne. | 552. | 1374 | Senlis. | 550. | 1326 |
| Constantinople. | 539. | 1340 | Nogaro. | 544. | 1303 | Sens. | 548. | 1320 |
| Constantinople. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1341 | Nogaro. | 548. | 1315 | T. | | |
| Constantinople. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1344 | Noyon. | 551. | 1344 | Toledo. | 548. | 1323 |
| Constantinople. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1346 | | | | Toledo. | 549. | 1324 |
| Constantinople. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1347 | P. | | | Toledo. | 551. | 1339 |
| Constantinople. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1355 | Palenza. | 553. | 1388 | Toledo. | 552. | 1347 |
| F. | | | Paris. | 491. | 1302 | Toledo. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1355 |
| Francfort. | 506. | 1338 | Paris. | 493. | 1303 | Tours. | 496. | 1308 |
| L. | | | Paris. | 498. | 1310 | V. | | |
| Lambeth. | 553. | 1330 | Paris. | 448. | 1314 | Valladolid. | 549. | 1322 |
| Lambeth. | 554. | 1351 | Paris. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1323 | Vienna in Dauphine. | 494. | 1311 |
| Lambeth. | <i>ibid.</i> | 1362 | Paris. | 526. | 1329 | | 545. | 1312 |
| Lavaur. | 552. | 1368 | Paris. | 551. | 1346 | Y. | | |
| | | | Paris. | 512. | 1398 | York. | 554. | 1367 |
| | | | Paris. | 513. | 1403 | | | |
| | | | Paris. | 514. | 1406 | | | |
| | | | Paris. | 516. | 1408 | | | |

The CONTENTS of the *Second Volume*, containing the Lives and Writings of the Ecclesiastical Authors, that Flourished in the *Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh,* *Twelfth, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Centuries.*

Of the *Seventh* Century.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| I Sidore of Sevil. | 1 |
| Braulio Bishop of Saragosa | 4 |
| Columbanus, Abbot | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Aleran, Presbyter in Ireland | 5 |
| Cumianus or Cuminus, Abbot in Ireland | 6 |
| Hefychius Priest of Jerusalem | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Eusebius of Thessalonica | 7 |
| Boniface IV. Bishop of Rome | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Deus-dedit Bishop of Rome | 8 |
| Johannes Philoponus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodosius, Monk | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Nicias | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Antiochus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| John of Thessalonica | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gregory of Antioch | 9 |
| John Bishop of Saragosa | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Justus Bishop of Toledo | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Conantius Palentinus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Boniface V. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Modestus Bishop of Jerusalem | <i>ibid.</i> |
| George of Alexandria | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Honorius | 10 |
| Sophronius of Jerusalem | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Johannes Moschus | 11 |
| Georgius Pisides | 12 |
| Eugenius Bishop of Toledo. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Apollonius, Presbyter of Novara | <i>ibid.</i> |
| John IV. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodorus I. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Martin I. | 13 |
| Maximus, Confessor. | 14 |
| Anastasius Disciple of Maximus | 16 |
| Anastasius Apocrypharius | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodosius and Theodorus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodorus Abbot of Raithu | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Peter of Laodicea | 17 |
| Thalassius | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Isaiah, Abbot | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theofridus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Donatus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Vitalianus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Eligius Bishop of Noyon | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Agatho Bishop of Rome | 20 |
| Leo II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Benedict II. | 21 |
| Drepanius Florus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Ildephonsus Bishop of Toledo | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Taio Bishop of Saragosa | 22 |
| Leontius Bishop of Cyprus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Marculphus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Cosma of Jerusalem | 23 |
| Pantaleo | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Julian of Toledo | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodorus Archbishop of Canterbury | 24 |
| Fruotuosus | 26 |
| Ceolphride, Abbot. | 27 |
| Aldelm Abbot of Malmesbury | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Adamannus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Aponius | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Crefconius | <i>ibid.</i> |
| John, Monk | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Demetrius Cyzicenus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Joannes Nicæunus | 28 |
| St. Audocnus, or St. Owen. | <i>ibid.</i> |

Of the *Eighth* Century.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|
| V enerable Bede | 28 |
| John Patriarch of Constantinople | 30 |
| Germanus Patriarch of Constantinople | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Boniface of Mentz | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gregory II. | 32 |
| Gregory III. | 33 |
| Zachary Bishop of Rome | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Andreas Cretensis | 35 |
| Anastasius, Abbot | <i>ibid.</i> |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Egbert Archbishop of York | 36 |
| St. John Damascene | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chrodegandus Bishop of Metz | 37 |
| Stephen II. | 38 |
| Willibald | 39 |
| John Patriarch of Jerusalem. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gottschalcus | 39 |
| Ambrosius Autpertus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Paul I. | 40 |
| Stephen III. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Adrian I. | 41 |
| Paul of Aquileia | 43 |
| Charles the Great | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Alcuin Deacon of York | 46 |
| Etherius | 48 |
| Paulinus of Aquileia | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodolphus Bishop of Orleans | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Leo III. | 49 |
| Some Greek Authors against the Icons. | |
| <i>clasts, viz. Tarasius, Epiphanius,</i> | |
| <i>and Theodosius</i> | 50 |
| Elias Cretensis. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| George Syncellus and Theophanus | <i>ibid.</i> |

Councils held in the *Seventh* Century.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| A Conference in 601. in England. | 1 |
| Assembly of Bishops at Chalton in | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 603. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Council of Toledo, under King Gondemar | <i>ibid.</i> |
| in 610. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Egara, under King Sisebut. held in the Year | <i>ibid.</i> |
| 614. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Paris V. | 2 |
| France, about the same, whereof the Place | |
| unknown. | 3 |
| Sevil II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Rheims, under Sonnatius | 4 |
| Toledo IV. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo V. held in 636. | 7 |
| Toledo VI. held in 638. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo VII. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Lateran, against the Monothelites, under | |
| Martin I. | 8 |
| Constantinople VI. General 3d. C. | 10 |
| Challon on the Saone | 16 |
| Toledo VIII. | 17 |
| Toledo IX. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo X. held in 656. | 18 |
| Conference held in Northumberland in | |
| 664. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Merida | 19 |
| Autun | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Hereford in England | 20 |
| Toledo XI. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Braga IV. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo XII. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo XIII. | 21 |
| Toledo XIV. | 22 |
| Toledo XV. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Saragosa | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo XVI. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Toledo XVII. held in 694. | 23 |
| Constantinople in 1692. called <i>Quinisextum</i> | <i>ibid.</i> |
| or in Trullo | <i>ibid.</i> |

Held in the *Eighth*.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| A Assembly at Berkhamsted in the Kingdom | |
| of Kent. | 26 |
| England, about the Affair of Wilfrid | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Rome, under Gregory II. | 27 |
| Germany, under Carloman | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Leistines | <i>ibid.</i> |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Rome under Zachary. | 28 |
| Soissons | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Rome II. under Zachary | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Cloueshaw. | 29 |
| Verberie | 30 |
| Verneuil | 31 |
| Metz | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Compeign | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Nice, for Images, VII. General, where | |
| are also produc'd the Acts of another As- | |
| sembly held at Constantinople in 754. a- | |
| gainst Images; and the Books written | |
| in France against these two Councils, to- | |
| gether with the Letters of the Pope on | |
| this Subject. | 32 |
| Northumberland | 44 |
| Aquileia | 45 |
| Rarisbonne. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Frankfort. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Rome, under Pope Leo III. | 46 |
| Aix-la-Chappelle, against Felix | 46 |

Of the *Ninth* Century,

| | |
|--|--------------|
| C hap. I. An account of what passed in | |
| the Eastern and Western Churches, at | |
| the beginning of the <i>Ninth</i> Century, about | |
| the Use and Worship of Images. Page. 47 | |
| The State of the Greek Church. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of Paris | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Claudius Clemens of Turin an Enemy to | |
| Images | 48 |
| Jonas Bishop of Orleans, his Judgment of | |
| Images | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Dungale's Treatise of Images | 49 |
| The Opinion of Agobardus about Images | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Walafridus Strabo's Judgment of the same | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Nicphorus Patriarch of Constantinople | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodorus Studita a Patron of Image Wor- | |
| ship | 51 |
| Joseph, Bishop of Thessalonica; a Maintai- | |
| ner of Image Worship. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Theodorus Graphus, the same | 52 |
| Theoeristus, the same | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Claudius of Turin his Works | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Dungale's Works | <i>ibid.</i> |
| C hap. II. A Relation of the Dispute con- | |
| cerning Grace and Predestination | 52 |
| The beginning of that Controversie | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Rabanus's Book against Gottschalcus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gottschalcus against Rabanus | 53 |
| The Council of Mentz against Gottschalcus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Life of Hincmarus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of Quiercy | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gottschalcus punish'd and imprison'd | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Two Confessions of Faith made by Gottsch- | |
| alcus | 54 |
| The Writings of Hincmarus, Bertram, and | |
| Rabanus against Predestination | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Lupus's Treatise upon the 3 Questions | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Lupus's letter to Hincmarus & Pardulus | 55 |
| His Letter to Charles the Bald | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Ratramnus, or Bertram's Treatise about Pre- | |
| destination | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Scotus's Book about Predestination | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Prudentius's Work against Scotus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Florus his Writings against Scotus | 56 |
| Amalor's Letters to Gottschalcus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Hincmarus's Letter to the Church of Lyons | <i>ibid.</i> |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| The Answer of the Church of Lyons to | |
| Hincmarus | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Articles of Quiercy | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Prudentius's Letter to the Council of Sens | 58 |
| The four Articles of Quiercy, as refuted by | |
| the Church of Lyons | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The | |

The CONTENTS.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The Canons of the Council of <i>Valence</i> about Grace <i>ibid.</i> | And another at <i>Rome</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Letter upon the Ordination of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| A Relation of what follow'd the Council of <i>Valence</i> about Grace <i>ibid.</i> | The Business of <i>Judith</i> and <i>Baldwin</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Constantinople</i> against <i>Ignatius</i> 90 |
| <i>Hincmarus's</i> second Treatise about Predestination 59 | The Affair of <i>Beson</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Canons of the Council of <i>Constantinople</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Hincmarus's</i> remarks on the Constitution of the Council of <i>Valence</i> about Ordinations 60 | That of Count <i>Raymond</i> 75 | The Persecution of <i>Ignatius</i> 91 |
| — His Treatise upon the Expression <i>Trina Deitas</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Rheims</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Letters upon the Deposition of <i>Ignatius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. III. A Relation of the Contest between <i>Hincmarus</i> and <i>Rothadus</i> Bishop of <i>Soissons</i> 60 | Synods of <i>Rheims</i> in 854 and 874 <i>ibid.</i> | A Council at <i>Rome</i> upon the Ordination of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Occasion of the Difference between <i>Hincmarus</i> and <i>Rothadus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Coronations of Kings <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Letter to <i>Michael</i> the Emperor <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Hincmarus's</i> Accusation <i>ibid.</i> | Some Instructions of <i>Hincmarus</i> to <i>Charles</i> the Bald <i>ibid.</i> | Other Letters of his upon the Affair of <i>Ignatius</i> 92 |
| <i>Rothadus's</i> Appeal to <i>Rome</i> 61 | <i>Hincmarus's</i> Answer to <i>Lewis</i> of <i>Germany</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Ill Treatment of <i>Ignatius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Condemnation of <i>Rothadus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Advice to King <i>Charles</i> 76 | The Council of <i>Photius</i> against the Pope <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Difference between the Pope and <i>Hincmarus</i> about it <i>ibid.</i> | A Remonstrance to <i>Lewis</i> of <i>Germany</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Ignatius</i> re-instated <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Hincmarus's</i> Letter to the Pope <i>ibid.</i> | The manner of proceeding against a Priest <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Constantinople</i> , being the VIII. General Council <i>ibid.</i> |
| Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Letter in favour of <i>Rothadus</i> 62 | The Condemnation of a Priest <i>ibid.</i> | Contestations upon <i>Bulgaria</i> 97 |
| The Conclusion of that Affair <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Hincmarus's</i> Book against <i>Ansegisus's</i> Privilege <i>ibid.</i> | The Pope's Legates taken by the <i>Sclavonians</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. IV. A Relation of the Contest between <i>Hincmarus</i> and <i>Wulfadus</i> , and other Clerks ordained by <i>Ebbo</i> , who had been Archbishop of <i>Rheims</i> 62 | The Council of <i>Pontigon</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Adrian's</i> Letter <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Soissons</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Hincmarus's</i> Letter about Appeals <i>ibid.</i> | New Troubles upon the Account of <i>Bulgaria</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Confirmation of the Council of <i>Soissons</i> by <i>Leo</i> the IV. and <i>Benedict</i> 63 | His Advice to <i>Lewis</i> the Bald <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Photius</i> returns to <i>Constantinople</i> , and is restored <i>ibid.</i> |
| Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Judgment about <i>Wulfadus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Tract upon the Duties of Bishops <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>John</i> the VIII. gives his Consent to <i>Photius's</i> Restoration 98 |
| The Council of <i>Soissons</i> in 866. <i>ibid.</i> | His Letter to <i>Charles</i> the <i>Grosse</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Council confirms his Restoration of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Pope <i>Nicholas's</i> Letter about the Judgment of the Council of <i>Soissons</i> 64 | The Election of the Bishop of <i>Beauvais</i> 77 | Pope <i>John</i> disowns what his Legates had done 99 |
| The Carriage of the Bishops of <i>France</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Hincmarus's</i> Advice to <i>Carloman</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The following Popes are against the Restoration of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Wulfadus</i> ordained Archbishop of <i>Bourges</i> 65 | His Writing against <i>Rapes</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Photius</i> turn'd out again <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Troyes</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Tract about Proofs <i>ibid.</i> | Letters from <i>P. Stephen</i> to the <i>Grecian</i> Bishops <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letter of that Council to the Pope against <i>Ebbo</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Absolution by Letter <i>ibid.</i> | The Bishops Answer <i>ibid.</i> |
| King <i>Charles's</i> Letter in favour of <i>Ebbo</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Form of Episcopal Ordinations <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Formosus's</i> Reply to the Bishops Letter to <i>Stephen</i> 100 |
| <i>Hincmarus's</i> Letter to the Pope 66 | <i>Hincmarus's</i> Treatise against the Translation of Bishops <i>ibid.</i> | The last Answers of the Pope's to the <i>Greeks</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Affair of <i>Affardus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Tract of the Judgment of Priests <i>ibid.</i> | Broils of the Church of <i>Rome</i> , with the <i>Greek</i> Churches <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Adrian's</i> Answers about <i>Ebbo</i> and <i>Affardus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Process against <i>Teutfridus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Photius's</i> Bibliotheca <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. V. A History of the several Contests that <i>Hincmarus</i> had with his Nephew <i>Hincmarus</i> Bishop of <i>Laon</i> 67 | The Vision of <i>Bernoldus</i> 78 | The <i>Nomocanon</i> of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Original of the Discontents between <i>Hincmarus</i> and his Nephew <i>ibid.</i> | A Relation of <i>K. Pepin's</i> Penitence <i>ibid.</i> | His Letters <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Contests between the Bishop of <i>Laon</i> and <i>Charles</i> the Bald <i>ibid.</i> | Several Letters of <i>Hincmarus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | His Sermons 102 |
| <i>Adrian's</i> Letter in favour of the Bishop of <i>Laon</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Editions of <i>Hincmarus's</i> Works <i>ibid.</i> | His Treatise concerning the Wills of <i>Christ</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Quarrels of the two <i>Hincmarus's</i> , about the Business of <i>Nivinus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | Chap. VII. The History of the Controversie upon the <i>Eucharist</i> , debated in the Ninth Century 69 | His Theological Treatises 103 |
| Another Difference between them about <i>Adulphus</i> 68 | The Importance of the Controversie <i>ibid.</i> | Some Works of <i>Photius</i> in Manuscript <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Bishop of <i>Laon</i> declared openly against his Uncle <i>ibid.</i> | The Life of <i>Paschasius</i> <i>ibid.</i> | A Censure on the Genius and Capacity of <i>Photius</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Difference between them at the Synod of <i>Attigny</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Paschasius's</i> Treatise concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Theodorus Abucara</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| Fifty five Articles of <i>Hincmar</i> in Answer to his Nephew 69 | The Editions of it 80 | Chap. X. An Account of the Controversies raised by <i>Photius</i> with the Church of <i>Rome</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Sequel of the Affair of <i>Hincmar</i> of <i>Laon</i> , after he left <i>Attigny</i> 70 | The State of the Question betwixt <i>Paschasius</i> and his Adversaries <i>ibid.</i> | Answers to the Heads of Accusation of the <i>Greeks</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| A Petition of <i>Hincmarus</i> of <i>Laon</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The first Author that opposes him 81 | Chap. XI. Several Constitutions made in Ecclesiastical Assemblies, about the Discipline of the Church 105 |
| The Answer to it <i>ibid.</i> | Who the Author is that bears the Name of <i>Bertram</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Aix la Chappelle</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Bishop of <i>Laon's</i> Answer <i>ibid.</i> | His Opinion 82 | <i>Arles</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| A new Contest between <i>Hincmarus</i> of <i>Laon</i> and the King 71 | The Book of <i>Joannes Scotus</i> upon the <i>Eucharist</i> 84 | <i>Mentz</i> 106 |
| He is cited to a Synod <i>ibid.</i> | Expressions of other Authors of this Age on that Subject <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Rheims</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Adrian's</i> Letter in favour of <i>Carloman</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Question of <i>Stercoranism</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Tours</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Douzy</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Amalaricus's</i> Opinion upon it 85 | <i>Chalons</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letter of <i>Hincmarus</i> of <i>Rheims</i> to <i>Adrian</i> 72 | <i>Rabanus</i> his Opinion on the same Question <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Aix la Chapelle</i> , in 816 107 |
| <i>Adrian's</i> Answer <i>ibid.</i> | The Sentiment of a Nameless Author on the same <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Celichish</i> in <i>England</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| King <i>Charles's</i> Answer to the Pope 73 | <i>Erigenius</i> , <i>Guitmondus</i> , and <i>Algerus</i> , their Opinions on it <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Aix la Chappelle</i> , in 817 <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Execution of the Judgment given against <i>Hincmarus</i> of <i>Laon</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The Opinion of the <i>Greeks</i> upon it <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Thionville</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Troyes</i> <i>ibid.</i> | The State of the Question amongst the <i>Latins</i> 86 | The Capitularies of <i>Lewis</i> the Godly <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. VI. An Account of several other Ecclesiastical Affairs transacted in <i>France</i> , wherein <i>Hincmarus</i> was chiefly engaged 73 | Chap. VIII. The History of the Controversie about the Manner in which the <i>Virgin Mary</i> brought forth <i>Christ</i> 86 | <i>Paris</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Divorce of the Queen <i>Theutberga</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Ratramnus</i> his Opinion of our Saviour's Birth <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Aix la Chappelle</i> in 836 109 |
| A Council at <i>Mentz</i> concerning it 74 | <i>Paschasius's</i> Opinion on it <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Thionville</i> , in 844 <i>ibid.</i> |
| | A Question upon the Nature of the Soul <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Vernuil</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | A Judgment upon <i>Ratramnus</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Beauvais</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | The Editions of <i>Ratramnus's</i> Book concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Meaux</i> and <i>Paris</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | The Editions of the other Books of <i>Ratramnus</i> 87 | The Capitularies of <i>Charles</i> the Bald 110 |
| | <i>Joannes Scotus Erigena</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Mentz</i> in 847 111 |
| | His Book concerning the Body and Blood of <i>Jesus Christ</i> <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Pavia</i> 112 |
| | The Books of <i>Natures</i> 88 | <i>Soissons</i> 123 |
| | His Translations <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Verbery</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | <i>Paschasius's</i> Works <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Rome</i> under <i>Leo</i> IV. <i>ibid.</i> |
| | Chap. IX. The History of the Contest betwixt <i>Photius</i> and <i>Ignatius</i> , about the Patriarchal See of <i>Constantinople</i> 88 | <i>Valence</i> 3d. C. 114 |
| | <i>Ignatius</i> his Birth <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Quiercy</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | The Character of <i>Photius</i> 89 | <i>Metz</i> in 859 <i>ibid.</i> |
| | His Ordination <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Savonieres</i> <i>ibid.</i> |
| | <i>Ignatius</i> Expell'd and Depos'd <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Coblentz</i> 115 |
| | | <i>Toul</i> |

The CONTENTS.

| | | | | | |
|---|-------|--|-------|---|-------|
| Toul | ibid. | John VIII. | 149 | Constantine Porphyrogeneta. | ibid. |
| Worms | ibid. | Marinus | ibid. | Hippolytus Thebanus. | ibid. |
| Donzy | 116 | Adrian III. | ibid. | Eutychius Patriarch of Alexandria. | ibid. |
| Ravenna | ibid. | Stephen V. | ibid. | Nico of Armenia. | ibid. |
| Troyes | 117 | Formosus | ibid. | Nicephorus the Philosopher. | 156 |
| Fismes | ibid. | Stephen VI. | ibid. | Moses Bar-Cephas. | ibid. |
| Cologne | ibid. | Romanus | ibid. | | |
| Metz | ibid. | | | Chap. II. An Account of the Church of | |
| Metz | 118 | Chap. XVII. The History of the Lives | | Rome, and other Italian Churches, du- | |
| Vienna | ibid. | and Martyrologies of the Saints in this | | ring the Tenth Century. | 156 |
| Tribur | ibid. | Century. | 150 | The State of the Church of Rome in the | |
| Nantes | 119 | Sergius | ibid. | Tenth Century. | ibid. |
| A Letter from the Clergy of Ravenna to | | Eginhardus | ibid. | The Ordination of Pope Formosus. | ibid. |
| Charles the Younger | 120 | Theganus | ibid. | The Condemnation of Formosus by Ste- | |
| A Letter of the Bishops of Germany to | | Petrus Sicilicus | ibid. | phen VI. | ibid. |
| John VIII. | ibid. | Anastasius Bibliothecarius | ibid. | Romanus and Theodorus two Popes. | ibid. |
| | | The anonymous Author of the Liber Syno- | | Pope John IX. | ibid. |
| Chap. XII. The Constitutions of some Bi- | | dicus | ibid. | The Wars between Berenger and Lambert. | |
| shops, and Collections of Canons, con- | | Michael Syncellus | ibid. | | ibid. |
| cerning the Discipline of the Church. | | Methodius | ibid. | The Council of Rome and Ravenna in fa- | |
| | 121 | Hilduinus Abbot of Medard, &c. | 151 | vour of Formosus | 157 |
| Hatto, Abbot of Angia Dives | ibid. | David Nicetas Paphlago | ibid. | Benedict X. Pope. | ibid. |
| Agobardus Archbishop of Lyons | ibid. | Leo the Wise, Emperor of the East | ibid. | Pope Christophorus. | ibid. |
| Amolo, or Amulo, a Deacon of the Church | | Theophanes Cerameus, Bishop of Taurome- | | Pope Sergius condemns Formosus. | ibid. |
| of Lyons | 126 | nium | ibid. | Pope Anastasius. | ibid. |
| Adelardus Abbot of Corbie | ibid. | Georgius Chartophylax | ibid. | The Death of Lambert | ibid. |
| Ansegisus Abbot of St. Wandrillus | 127 | Ludgerus Bishop of Munster | ibid. | Landon an unworthy Pope. | ibid. |
| Halgarius Bishop of Cambray | ibid. | Ægil Abbot of Fulda | ibid. | Pope John X. | ibid. |
| Isaac Bishop of Langres | ibid. | Vulfinus Baerius Bishop of Poitiers | ibid. | Pope Leo VI. | ibid. |
| Herard Archbishop of Tours | ibid. | Hermenricus Abbot of Elwangen | ibid. | Pope Stephen VII. | ibid. |
| Wauterius, or Gausterius, Bishop of Orleans | | Eulogius Martyr | ibid. | John XI. a Monster of a Pope. | ibid. |
| | ibid. | Alvarius | ibid. | Alberic becomes Master of Rome. | ibid. |
| Wulfadus Archbishop of Bourges | ibid. | Herricus, a Monk of St. Germans at Auxer- | | The Wars of Italy. | ibid. |
| Riculphus Bishop of Soissons | ibid. | re | ibid. | Manasses relinquishes his Archbishoprick of | |
| Elias Bishop of Jerusalem | ibid. | Anscharius a Monk of Corbey | 152 | Arles to go into Italy. | 158 |
| Luitbertus Archbishop of Metz | ibid. | Rudolphus a Monk of Fulda | ibid. | Pope Leo VII. | ibid. |
| Regino Abbot of Prom | ibid. | Ifo a Monk of St. Gallus | ibid. | Pope Stephen VIII. | ibid. |
| Auxilius ordained Priest by Pope Formosus | | Alfridus Bishop of Munster, and Ortheagri- | | Pope Marinus II. | ibid. |
| | 128 | nus a Monk of Werthim | ibid. | Pope Agapetus II. | ibid. |
| | | Ermentarius Abbot of Noicmontier | ibid. | The Wars between Hugh and Berenger. | ibid. |
| Chap. XIII. Certain Questions about the | | Atilo a Monk of St. Amandus | ibid. | Pope John XII. | 159 |
| Rites and Ceremonies of the Church | | Aimonius a Monk of St. German de Prez | ibid. | The Wars of Berenger and Otho. | ibid. |
| | 130 | | ibid. | Otho crown'd Emperor by John XII. | ibid. |
| Amalaricus Fortunatus Archbishop of Triers | ibid. | Abbo a Monk of St. German de Prez | ibid. | The Disloyalty of Pope John XII. | ibid. |
| | ibid. | Wulfadus a Monk of Hattennede | ibid. | Otho returns to Rome, and causes John XII. | |
| Jesse Bishop of Amiens | ibid. | Hugobaldus, a Monk of St. Amandus | ibid. | to be depos'd | ibid. |
| Odilbert Archbishop of Milan | ibid. | Alfredus King of England | ibid. | The Council at Rome against John XII. | 160 |
| Theodolphus Bishop of Orleans | ibid. | Rembertus Archbishop of Bremen | ibid. | The Ordination of Pope Leo VIII. | ibid. |
| Leidradus Archbishop of Lyons | ibid. | Herimbertus, a Monk of Mount Cassin | ibid. | The tragical Death of Pope John XII. | ibid. |
| Amalaricus a Deacon of Metz | ibid. | Almanus, a Monk of Hautevilliers | ibid. | Benedict the Antipope, | ibid. |
| Rabanus, or Herbanus Archbishop of Metz | | Adelinus, Bishop of Seaz | 153 | Benedict is depos'd, and Leo the VIII. re- | |
| | 131 | Osfredus, a Monk of Weiffenberg | ibid. | established, | ibid. |
| Walafridus Strabo, Abbot of Richenou | 132 | Aldrevaldus, a Monk of Fleury | ibid. | Pope John XIII. | 160 |
| | | Afferius, Bishop of Sherburn | ibid. | The Council of Ravenna in the Year | 967. |
| Chap. XIV. Orders and Constitutions re- | | Florus, a Deacon of Lyons | ibid. | | 161. |
| lating to a Monastick Life, made by the | | Wandelbert, a Monk of Prom | ibid. | Pope Donus and Pope Benedict VI. | ibid. |
| Authors of this Age | 136 | Rabanus of Metz | ibid. | Boniface the Usurper outed by Benedict, | ibid. |
| Benedict Abbot of Aniana | ibid. | Ado Archbishop of Vienna | ibid. | The Wars and Death of Otho II. | ibid. |
| Ardo Smaragdus a Scholar of St. Benedict | | Ufuardus, a Monk of St. Germans de Prez | ibid. | Otho III. crown'd Emperor, | ibid. |
| | 137 | | ibid. | Pope John XIV. | ibid. |
| Hildemarus a Monk | ibid. | Gildas | ibid. | Boniface returns to Rome, | ibid. |
| Lupus Abbot of Ferrara | ibid. | Conclusion. | ibid. | Pope John XV. | ibid. |
| | | | | Pope Gregory V. | ibid. |
| Chap. XV. Commentaries upon the Holy | | | | John the Antipope, | ibid. |
| Scripture, written in the Ninth Centu- | | | | Gerbert nam'd Pope Sylvester II. | ibid. |
| ry | 140 | | | The Letters of John IX. | 162. |
| The Nature of the Commentaries upon the | | | | Hervetus Archbishop of Rheims's Memori- | |
| Holy Scriptures, composed in the Ninth | | | | al concerning Repentance, | ibid. |
| Century | ibid. | | | The Letters of Benedict IV. | ibid. |
| The Commentaries of Florus Deacon of | | | | The Letter of Hatto Archbishop of Metz | |
| Lyons | ibid. | | | to John IX. | ibid. |
| His other Writings | ibid. | | | The Letters of the Bishops of Bava- | |
| Commentaries of Haymo Bishop of Halber- | | | | ria to John IX. | ibid. |
| stadt | ibid. | | | The Council of Rome under John IX. | ibid. |
| His other Works | ibid. | | | The Council of Ravenna under John IX. | |
| Commentaries of Angelomus a Monk of | | | | | 163. |
| Fulda | ibid. | | | The Letters of Pope John X. | ibid. |
| Commentaries of Sedulius | ibid. | | | The Letters of Charles the Simple about | |
| Commentaries of Druthmarus, a Monk of | | | | Hilduin, | ibid. |
| Corbie | ibid. | | | The Letters of Pope Leo VII. | ibid. |
| Commentaries of Remigius of Auxerre | | | | A Letter of Pope Agapetus, | 164 |
| | 141 | | | The Letters of John XII. | ibid. |
| | | | | The Letters of John XIII. | ibid. |
| Chap. XVI. The History of the Popes | | | | The Letters of Benedict VII. | ibid. |
| that enjoyed the Holy See during the | | | | The Letters of John XV. | ibid. |
| Ninth Century | 141 | | | The Letters of Gregory V. | ibid. |
| Stephen IV. | ibid. | | | Ratherius Bishop of Verona, | ibid. |
| Paschal I | ibid. | | | Atto Bishop of Verceil, | 168 |
| Eugenius II. | ibid. | | | Luitprand Bishop of Cremona, | 169 |
| Valentinus | ibid. | | | Chap. III. An Account of the Churches | |
| Gregory IV. | ibid. | | | of France, | ibid. |
| Sergius II. | ibid. | | | The Dignity of the Church of Rheims, | ibid. |
| Leo IV. | ibid. | | | | ibid. |
| Benedict III. | ibid. | | | The State of France after the Death of | |
| Nicholas I. | ibid. | | | Charles the Gross, | 170 |
| Adrian II. | 143 | | | The Reign of Charles the Simple, | ibid. |

Of the Tenth Century.

AN Account of the most considerable Transactions in the Eastern Church during the Tenth Century. 154
 Leo the Philosopher Emperor of the East ib.
 The Disturbances which happen'd in the Eastern Church upon the Account of Leo's fourth Marriage. ibid.
 Nicholas Patriarch of Constantinople is banish'd. ibid.
 Nicholas is re-established, ibid.
 The Letters of Nicholas Patriarch of Constantinople to the Pope and others. ibid.
 The Re-union of the Clergy of Constantinople. ibid.
 The Patriarchs of Constantinople who succeeded Nicholas. ibid.
 Theophylact an unworthy Patriarch of Constantinople. ibid.
 Polyucta Patriarch of Constantinople. ibid.
 Nicephorus Phocas Emperor, ibid.
 John Zemiscas Emperor. ibid.
 The Death of Polyucta, and Basil put in his Place. ibid.
 Antony Studita Patriarch of Constantinople. ibid.
 Nicholas Chrysobergius and Sifinnius Patriarchs of Constantinople. 155
 Simeon Metaphrastes. ibid.
 John Cameniates. ibid.

The Letters of John IX. 162.
 Hervetus Archbishop of Rheims's Memorial concerning Repentance, ibid.
 The Letters of Benedict IV. ibid.
 The Letter of Hatto Archbishop of Metz to John IX. ibid.
 The Letters of the Bishops of Bavaria to John IX. ibid.
 The Council of Rome under John IX. ibid.
 The Council of Ravenna under John IX. 163.
 The Letters of Pope John X. ibid.
 The Letters of Charles the Simple about Hilduin, ibid.
 The Letters of Pope Leo VII. ibid.
 A Letter of Pope Agapetus, 164
 The Letters of John XII. ibid.
 The Letters of John XIII. ibid.
 The Letters of Benedict VII. ibid.
 The Letters of John XV. ibid.
 The Letters of Gregory V. ibid.
 Ratherius Bishop of Verona, ibid.
 Atto Bishop of Verceil, 168
 Luitprand Bishop of Cremona, 169
 Chap. III. An Account of the Churches of France, ibid.
 The Dignity of the Church of Rheims, ibid.
 The State of France after the Death of Charles the Gross, 170
 The Reign of Charles the Simple, ibid.

The C O N T E N T S.

The Reign of *Radulphus*, *ibid.*
The Reign of *Lewis d'Ostremer*, *ibid.*
The Reign of *Lotharius*, *ibid.*
Lewis the Fainthearted the last King of the *Corolignian Race*, *ibid.*
Hugh Capet and *Robert*, Kings of *France*, *ibid.*
Fulcus Archbishop of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
A Letter of Pope *Stephen V.* to *Fulcus*, *ibid.*
Other Letters of *Stephen V.* to *Fulcus*, 171
Other Writings of *Stephen V.* in favour of the Church of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
The Letters of *Fulcus* to *Formosus*, *ibid.*
The Letters of *Formosus* to *Fulcus*, *ibid.*
The Letters of *Fulcus* to Pope *Stephen VI.*, *ibid.*
The Letters of *Fulcus* to the Kings and Princes, *ibid.*
The Letters of *Fulcus* to the Bishops, 172
The Letters of *Fulcus* to the Abbots, *ibid.*
Herveus Archbishop of *Rheims*, 173
The Council of *Troisy* in the Year 909, *ibid.*
The Council of *Troisy* in the year 921, *ibid.*
Seulphus Archbishop of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
Hugh elected Archbishop of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
The Wars between *Hebert*, Count of *Vermandois* and King *Radulphus*, *ibid.*
The State of *France* under King *Radulphus*, *ibid.*
Artaldus Archbishop of *Rheims*, 174
The Council held at *Soissons* for the deposing *Artaldus* and ordaining *Hugh*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Verdun* in favour of *Artaldus*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Mouzon* against *Hugh*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Ingelheim* in favour of *Artaldus*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Mouzon* in the year 948, *ibid.*
The Council of *Treves* or *Trier* in the same year, 175
The Death of *Artaldus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
Odalric and *Adalbero* Archbishops of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
Arnulphus Archbishop of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Rheims* against *Arnulphus*, 176
Gerbert Archbishop of *Rheims*, 177
The Council of *Mouzon* in the year 995, *ibid.*
The Synod of *Rheims* against *Gerbert*, 178
The re-establishment of *Arnulphus* in the Bishoprick of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
The Writings of *Gerbert*, *ibid.*
Floard Prebendary of *Rheims*, *ibid.*
Aurelian Clerk of the Church of *Rheims*, 179
Bernerus Monk of *S. Rémy* at *Rheims*, *ibid.*
Gautier Archbishop of *Sens*, 180
Of the other Bishops of *France*, *ibid.*
The Resolutions of the Bishops of *France* concerning the Dedication of a Church, *ibid.*
The Council of *Charroux* in the year 989, *ibid.*
The Council of *Poitiers* in the year 999, *ibid.*
The Council of *Ravenna* in the year 997, *ibid.*
The Marriage of King *Robert* with *Bertha*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Rome* in the year 998, under *Gregory V.*, 181
The Founding of the Abby of *Cluny*, *ibid.*
Cutho Abbot of *Cluny*, *ibid.*
John Monk of *Cluny*, 182
Odilo Abbot of *Cluny*, *ibid.*
Abbo Abbot of *Fleury*, *ibid.*
The Council of *S. Denis* in the year 995, 183
Aimoin Monk of *Fleury*, *ibid.*
Stephen Abbot of *Lobes*, *ibid.*
Fulcuin Abbot of *Lobes*, *ibid.*
Heriger Abbot of *Lobes*, *ibid.*
Aldebold Bishop of *Utrecht*, *ibid.*
Albert Abbot of *Gemblours*, *ibid.*
Odilo Monk of *S. Medard* at *Soissons*, 184
Gerard Abbot of *Medard* at *Soissons*, *ibid.*
John Abbot of *S. Arnulphus* at *Metz*, *ibid.*
Helperic, or *Chilperic* Monk of *S. Gall*, *ibid.*
Lethier Priest of *Verdun*, *ibid.*
Adso Abbot of *Luxeuil*, *ibid.*
Adso Abbot of *Deuvres*, *ibid.*
Letaldus Monk of *S. Memin*, *ibid.*
Chap. IV. The History of the Churches of Germany, 184
The Revolutions of the Empire of Germany in the tenth Century, *ibid.*
S. Ulric Bishop of *Augsburg*, 185
Adalbero Bishop of *Augsburg*, 186
The two *Adalberts* who were Saints, *ibid.*
Bruno Archbishop of *Cologne*, *ibid.*
Roger Monk of *S. Pantaleon*, *ibid.*
Rathboldus Bishop of *Utrecht*, *ibid.*
Hildebert Archbishop of *Mentz*, *ibid.*
William Archbishop of *Mentz*, *ibid.*
Bonno Abbot of *Corbey* in *Saxony*, *ibid.*
Waltramnus Bishop of *Strasburg*, 187
Solomon Bishop of *Constance*, *ibid.*
Utho Bishop of *Strasburg*, *ibid.*
Notger the *Stammerer*, *ibid.*
Witichindus Monk of *Corbey* in *Westphalia*, *ibid.*
Rofwida a Nun, *ibid.*
Reginaldus Bishop of *Eichstadt*, *ibid.*
Thierry Archbishop of *Triers*, *ibid.*
Othlo Bishop of *Metz*, 188
Uffing or *Uffo* Monk of *Werthin*, *ibid.*
A Council at *Coblentz*, in the year 922, *ibid.*
A Council at *Erfurdt* in the year 932, *ibid.*
A Council at *Augsburg* in the year 952, *ibid.*
Chap. V. An Account of the Churches of England, 188
The State of England in the tenth Century, *ibid.*
A Council at *Canterbury* under King *Edward* and *Phlegmon* Archbishop of that City, *ibid.*
King *Edward's* Laws, *ibid.*
King *Ethelstan's* Laws, 189
An Ecclesiastical Assembly under King *Edmund*, *ibid.*
Odo Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *ibid.*
An Assembly of Bishops at *London* in the year 948, *ibid.*
S. Dunstan Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *ibid.*
A General Council of England in the year 973, 190
A Council under *S. Dunstan* and King *Edward*, *ibid.*
A Council at *Winchester* in the year 975, *ibid.*
S. Ethelwold Bishop of *Winchester*, *ibid.*
Alfric or *Ælfric* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *ibid.*
Fridegod Monk of *S. Saviour* at *Canterbury*, *ibid.*
Lanfrid and *Wulfstan* Monks of *Winchester*, *ibid.*
Chap. VI. Observations on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Tenth Century, *ibid.*
Controversies about Doctrinal Points, *ibid.*
Of the Eucharist, *ibid.*
Of the Popes Authority, 191
Several Points of Discipline, *ibid.*
The Cannonization of Saints, 192
The Institution of the seven Electors of the Empire, *ibid.*
The Council of *Roan* held against him in 1063, *ibid.*
The Council of *Poitiers* against him in 1075, *ibid.*
Eusebius or *Bruno*, Bishop of *Angers's* Letter to *Berenger*, *ibid.*
The Councils of *Rome* held in 1078, and 1079, against *Berenger*, under Pope *Gregory VII.*, 199
Berenger's second Confession of Faith, *ibid.*
The Council of *Bourdeaux* in 1080, against *Berenger*, *ibid.*
Berenger's Repentance, *ibid.*
—His followers, *ibid.*
—Other Errors laid to his Charge, *ibid.*
—His Writings and Adversaries, *ibid.*
CHAP. III. Of the Writings of *Lanfrank*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, of *Guistmond*, of *Alger*, and of the other Authors who have refuted *Berenger's* Opinions, 199
Lanfrank, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, *ibid.*
The Council of *Windfor*, 200
Lanfrank's Commentary on *St. Paul's* Epistles, *ibid.*
—His Treatise of the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*, *ibid.*
The Rules of the Order of *St. Benedict*, 201
Lanfrank's Letters, *ibid.*
—His Treatise of Confession, 202
—His other Writings, *ibid.*
Hugh, Bishop of *Langres*, *ibid.*
Darandus, Abbot of *Troan*, *ibid.*
Guistmond, Archbishop of *Liveria*, *ibid.*

The CONTENTS.

| | | | | | |
|--|--------------|--|--------------|--|--------------|
| The Convention at <i>Oppenheim</i> against that Prince, | 215. | —That of the Archbishop of <i>Roan</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters to the Popes, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Emperor <i>Henry's</i> Journey into <i>Italy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —That of the Canons of <i>St. Omer</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters to the Cardinals, | 239. |
| The Complaints made by the <i>Lombards</i> against <i>Henry's</i> Conduct, | <i>ibid.</i> | Cardinal <i>Richard</i> elected Abbot of <i>Mar-</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters to the Archbishops, | 240. |
| The Convention at <i>Forcheim</i> , where <i>Rodulphus</i> is chosen Emperor, | 216. | <i>seilles</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters to the Bishops, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Rome</i> in 1078. | 217 | <i>Gregory VII's</i> Letter concerning Discipline, | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters to the Clergy, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Another Council at <i>Rome</i> the same Year, | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters relating to Monastick Dis- | 229. | —His Character, | 242. |
| The Council of <i>Rome</i> in 1079. | <i>ibid.</i> | cipline. | | <i>Petrus de Honestis</i> , a Clerk of <i>Ravenna</i> . | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Rome</i> in 1080. in which <i>Henry</i> is excommunicated and deposed by the Pope, | 218. | —The various Judgments pass'd upon that Pope, | <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. IX. An Account of the Churches of <i>England</i> , from the Time of <i>William I</i> surnam'd the Conqueror, to <i>Henry I</i> . with the Life of <i>St. Anselm</i> Archbishop of <i>Canterbury</i> , and an Abridgment of his Writings, | 242. |
| The Council of <i>Brescia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —An Examen of the Decree call'd <i>Dictatus Papa</i> , said to belong to him, | 230. | <i>St. Anselm</i> , Archbishop of <i>Canterbury</i> , | 243. |
| <i>Clement III.</i> the Anti-pope. | <i>ibid.</i> | —His other Writings, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Eadmar</i> , <i>St. Anselm's</i> Pupil, | 245. |
| <i>Henry's</i> Letter to <i>Gregory VII.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. VI. An Account of the Church of <i>Rome</i> , and of the Popes who succeeded <i>Gregory VII.</i> to the end of the Century, | <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. X. Of the Ecclesiastical Writers of the Eleventh Age, who compos'd Treatises of Church-Discipline, or Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, | 247. |
| The Preparations of War between <i>Henry</i> and <i>Gregory</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Victor III.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Burchard</i> , Bishop of <i>Worms</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Henry</i> defeats <i>Rodulphus</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Hugh</i> , Archbishop of <i>Lyons's</i> Letter against <i>Victor</i> , | 231. | <i>Godehard</i> , Bishop of <i>Hildesheim</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Expedition into <i>Italy</i> , and the Siege of <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Benevento</i> held in the Year 1087. under <i>Victor</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Gosbert</i> , Abbot of <i>Tergernsee</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —He returns to <i>Germany</i> , and <i>Gregory VII.</i> set at Liberty by the <i>Normans</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Urban II.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Guy Aretin</i> , Abbot of <i>La Croix St. Len-</i> | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Convention at <i>Berchach A. D.</i> 1085. | <i>ibid.</i> | —His Letters, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>froy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Assembly at <i>Quintineburgh</i> in the same Year, | <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Rome</i> held in the Year 1089. | 232. | <i>Ariho</i> , Archbishop of <i>Mentz</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Convention at <i>Mentz</i> in the same Year, | 219. | The Council of <i>Melfi</i> in the same Year, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Berno</i> Abbot of <i>Richenaw</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Death of Pope <i>Gregory VII.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Toulouse</i> in 1090. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Bruno</i> , Bishop of <i>Wurtzburg</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Contest between <i>Gregory VII.</i> and <i>Philip I.</i> King of <i>France</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Benevento</i> in 1091. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>John</i> surnam'd <i>Jeannelin</i> , Abbot of <i>Er-</i> | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Judgment pass'd by <i>Hugh</i> Bishop of <i>Die</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Troia</i> in <i>Apulia</i> in 1093. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Ereslein</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Gregory VII's</i> Letters relating to <i>England</i> . | 220. | —Of <i>Constance</i> in 1094. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Warin</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Arnulphus</i> at <i>Mets</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Pretensions upon <i>Spain</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Placentia</i> in 1095. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>William</i> , Abbot of the same Monastery, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Claim to the Kingdoms newly converted, | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Clermont</i> in the same Year, | 233. | <i>Robert de Tombalene</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Victor</i> at <i>Bayeux</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Pretensions to <i>Hungary</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Philip I.</i> King of <i>France</i> divorc'd from <i>Bertha</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Anselm</i> , Bishop of <i>Lucca</i> , | 247. |
| —His Letters to the King of <i>Denmark</i> , | 221. | The Council of <i>Autun</i> in the Year 1094. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Deus dedit</i> , Cardinal of <i>St. Eudoxia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Letters sent to <i>Poland</i> and <i>Rus-</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | The Crusade under Pope <i>Urban II.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Gregory</i> , Cardinal of <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>sia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Canons of the Council of <i>Clermont</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Benno</i> , Cardinal of the same Church, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Letters sent to <i>Norway</i> and <i>Dal-</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | The Confirmation of the Primacy of <i>Lyons</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Conrad</i> , Bishop of <i>Utrecht</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>matia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Limoges</i> in the Year 1095. | 234. | <i>Weneric</i> , Bishop of <i>Verceil</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Letters concerning <i>Bohemia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Councils of <i>Tours</i> and <i>Nismes</i> | 1096. | <i>Ulric</i> , a Monk of <i>Cluny</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Pretensions to <i>Italy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Canons of the Council of <i>Nismes</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Bernard</i> , a Monk of the same Abby, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Conquests of the <i>Normans</i> in <i>Italy</i> , | 222. | The Councils of <i>Bari</i> and <i>Rome</i> in 1098. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Bernard</i> , a Monk of <i>Corby</i> in <i>Saxony</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Differences and Arguments of <i>Gregory VII.</i> with the <i>Normans</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of <i>Rome</i> in 1099. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Bernard</i> , a Clerk of the Church of <i>Utrecht</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Pretensions to <i>Sardinia</i> and <i>Corfu</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | —Of <i>Roan</i> in 1096. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Egilnothus</i> , Archbishop of <i>Canterbury</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —The Oath of Fidelity exacted by him from the Princes of <i>Italy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. VII. An Account of the Controversies on foot between the <i>Latin</i> and the <i>Greek</i> Churches in the Eleventh Century. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Campanus</i> , of <i>Lombardy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Project of the Crusade, | 223. | <i>Michael Cerularius</i> and <i>Leo</i> of <i>Acridia</i> , their Letter against the Church of <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Franco</i> , a Philosopher of <i>Liege</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Letter sent into <i>Africa</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Leo IX's</i> Letter to <i>Cerularius</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Berthorius</i> , Abbot of <i>Mount Cassin</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Letter against the Errors charg'd upon the <i>Armenians</i> , | 224. | The Greek Emperor's Letter to the Pope, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Erard</i> , a <i>Benedictin</i> Monk, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —His Legates sent to several Parts, | <i>ibid.</i> | The Pope sends Legates to <i>Constantinople</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Adam</i> , Abbot of <i>Perfeme</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Councils held in <i>France</i> by <i>Hugh</i> Bishop of <i>Die A. D.</i> 1077. | <i>ibid.</i> | Pope <i>Leo IX's</i> Letters to <i>Cerularius</i> , and to the Greek Emperor, | <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XI. Of the Authors who wrote Ecclesiastical History, or the Lives of the Saints in the Eleventh Century, | 247. |
| The Council of <i>Poitiers</i> in 1078. | <i>ibid.</i> | Cardinal <i>Humbert</i> delivers those Letters and Writings to that Prince, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Megenfroy</i> or <i>Meginfred</i> , a Monk of <i>Fluda</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Canons of that Council, | 225. | —His Reply to <i>Cerularius's</i> Letter, | 235. | <i>Syrus</i> , a Monk of <i>Cluny</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Councils of <i>Avignon</i> and <i>Meaux</i> in 1080. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Nicetas Pectoratus's</i> Dissertation against the <i>Latin</i> Church, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Osburn</i> or <i>Oshert</i> , a Monk of <i>Canterbury</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Meaux</i> in 1082. | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Humbert's</i> Reply to <i>Nicetas</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Tangmarus</i> , Dean of <i>Hildesheim</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Vicars of several Popes in <i>France</i> . | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Nicetas's</i> Retraction, | 236. | <i>Arnold</i> , a Canon of <i>Hersfeldt</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The erecting of the Primacy of <i>Lyons</i> by <i>Gregory VII.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> | The Excommunication of <i>Michael Cerularius</i> by the Pope's Legates, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Eberard</i> , <i>St. Harvic's</i> Pupil, | 248. |
| The Rights and Privileges of the Primate of <i>France</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | The Departure of the Pope's Legates, | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Arnulphus</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Emmeran</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Cause of <i>Manasses</i> Archbishop of <i>Rheims</i> , | 226. | <i>Dominick</i> Patriarch of <i>Grado's</i> Letter to <i>Peter</i> Patriarch of <i>Antioch</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Erchinfroy</i> , Abbot of <i>Melck</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Those of the Archbishop of <i>Tours</i> and of the Bishop of <i>Dol</i> , | 227. | <i>Peter</i> of <i>Antioch's</i> Answer to the Patriarch of <i>Grado</i> , | 237. | <i>Rupert</i> , Abbot of <i>Mount Cassin</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —That of the Bishop of <i>Toul</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Cerularius's</i> Letter to <i>Peter</i> of <i>Antioch</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Dithmar</i> , Bishop of <i>Mersburg</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —That of <i>William</i> Duke of <i>Aquitaine</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Peter</i> of <i>Antioch's</i> Answer to <i>Cerularius</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Adeimar</i> or <i>Aimar</i> , de <i>Chabanois</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Gibar</i> at <i>Angouleme</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Those which Pope <i>Gregory VII.</i> heard and try'd at <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | A new Attempt made for the re-uniting the <i>Greek</i> and the <i>Latin</i> Churches, | 238. | <i>Hugh</i> Archbishop of <i>Tours</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Those that he referr'd to his Legates, | <i>ibid.</i> | The Banishment of <i>Cerularius</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Odoran</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Peter Le Vif</i> at <i>Sens</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Those cited to and judg'd by him in the same City, | 228. | CHAP. VIII. Of the Life and Writings of <i>Peter Damian</i> , Cardinal Bishop of <i>Ostia</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | <i>Anselm</i> , Dean of <i>Namur</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —That of <i>Everard</i> Dean of <i>Orleans</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | | | <i>Hermannus Contractus</i> , a Monk of <i>Richenaw</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —That of <i>Robert</i> nominated to the Bishoprick of <i>Chartres</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | | | <i>Glaker Radulphus</i> , a Monk of <i>Cluny</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —That of <i>Stephen</i> Bishop of <i>Anneay</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> | | | <i>Gualdo</i> , a Monk of <i>Corbey</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Drogo</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Winock</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Helgaud</i> , a Monk of <i>Fleury</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Wippo</i> or <i>Wippo</i> , Chaplain to the Emperor <i>Henry III.</i> | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Eberuin</i> or <i>Everuin</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Maurice</i> at <i>Tolen</i> . | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Everhelm</i> , Abbot of <i>Aumount</i> in <i>Hainaut</i> | 249. |
| | | | | <i>Guibert</i> , Archdeacon of <i>Toul</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Metellus</i> , Abbot of <i>Tergernsee</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | <i>Folcard</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Berthin</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | | | M 2 Gerard, | |

CONTENTS.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Gerard</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Vincent</i> at <i>Laon</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Willeran</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Peter</i> at <i>Mersburg</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Orso</i> , Abbot of <i>Aimont</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Desiderius</i> , Abbot of <i>Mount Cassin</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Paul</i> , a Canon of <i>Benrieden</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Conrad</i> , a Monk of <i>Bravilliers</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Geffrey de Maletterre</i> , a Norman Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>William</i> , of <i>Apulia</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Bertulphus</i> or <i>Bernulphus</i> , a Priest of <i>Constance</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nalgod</i> , a Monk of <i>Cluny</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Othlo</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Boniface</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Ingulphus</i> , Abbot of <i>Croyland</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Thierry</i> or <i>Theodoric</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Trudo</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Alphanus</i> , Archbishop of <i>Salerno</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Amatus</i> , a Bishop in <i>Italy</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Hepidannus</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Gall</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Marianus Storus</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Lambert</i> of <i>Aschaffenburg</i> , a Monk of <i>Hirsfeldt</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Adam</i> , a Canon of <i>Bremen</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Albert</i> , a Benedictin Monk of <i>Metz</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Anselm</i> , a Benedictin Monk of <i>Rheims</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gombier</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Amand</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Warman</i> , Bishop of <i>Constance</i> , 250. | |
| <i>Briswol</i> , Bishop of <i>Winchester</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Ingelran</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Riquier</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Bertha</i> or <i>Bertrada</i> , a Nun of <i>Willock</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gislebert</i> , a Monk of <i>St. German</i> at <i>Auxerre</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Diodericus</i> , a Monk of <i>Hirsfeldt</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Andrew</i> , a Monk of <i>Fleury</i> , or of <i>St. Benedict</i> on the <i>Loire</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Odo</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Maur des Fosses</i> , 250. | |
| <i>Bavo</i> , Abbot of <i>St. Bersin</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gislebert</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Amand</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>St. William</i> , Abbot of <i>Richenaw</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Alberic</i> , Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Josfald</i> , a Monk of <i>Cluny</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Wolferus</i> , a Canon of <i>Hildesheim</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gotzelin</i> , a Monk of <i>Canterbury</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Peter</i> , a Monk of <i>Maillezais</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>William</i> , a Monk of <i>Chiuffi</i> in <i>Tuscany</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Raymond</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Andrews</i> at <i>Aignon</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Haymo</i> , a Monk of <i>Richenaw</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gerard de Venna</i> , a Monk of <i>La Chaise-Dieu</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Eisward</i> , a Monk of <i>St. Burchard</i> at <i>Wurtzburg</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Gautier</i> or <i>Gauterius</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Grimaldus</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Rudolf</i> , a Monk of <i>La Chaise-Dieu</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nogerus</i> , Abbot of <i>Hautevilliers</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>W.</i> a Monk of <i>Windfor</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |

CHAP. XII. Of the Greek Ecclesiastical Writers, who flourish'd in the Eleventh Century.

| | |
|--|--|
| <i>Leo</i> , the Grammarian, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Alexius</i> , Patriarch of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Eusebius</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Theophanes</i> , the Ceremean Archbishop of <i>Tauromenium</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nilus Doxopatrius</i> , Archimandrita, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nicetas Peftoratus</i> , a Monk of <i>Studa</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Michael Psellus</i> , a Senator of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Simeon the Young</i> , Abbot of <i>Zerocerce</i> , 252. | |
| <i>John</i> , Archbishop of <i>Euchaita</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Joannes Thracius Scylitzes Curopolata</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Georgius Cedrenus</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Constantinus Lichudes</i> , Patriarch of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>John Xiphilin</i> , Patriarch of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Samonas</i> , Archbishop of <i>Gaza</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nicolas</i> , Bishop of <i>Metone</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Theophylact</i> , Archbishop of <i>Artis</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nicetas Serron</i> , Archbishop of <i>Heraclea</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Nicolas</i> , surnam'd the Grammarian, Patriarch of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Peter</i> , Deacon and Chartophylax of the Church of <i>Constantinople</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Samuel</i> of <i>Morocco</i> , a converted Jew, <i>ibid.</i> | |

CHAP. XIII. Of the Councils held in Eleventh Century.

| | |
|--|--------------|
| The Councils of <i>France</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Orleans</i> held in the Year 1017. | 253. |
| The Synod of <i>Arras</i> in 1025. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Bourges</i> in 1031. | 254. |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| —Of <i>Limoges</i> held in the same Year, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Divers Councils held in <i>France</i> in 1040. | 253. |
| The Council of <i>Rheims</i> in 1049. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Tours</i> in 1060. | 258. |
| —Of <i>Soissons</i> in 1092. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Roscelin</i> , a Clerk of the Church of <i>Compiègne</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| <i>Theobald</i> , a Clerk of <i>Etampes</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Divers Councils held in <i>Normandy</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Roan</i> conven'd A. D. 1050. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Lisieux</i> in 1055. | 259. |
| —Of <i>Roan</i> in 1063. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Roan</i> in 1072. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| A Quarrel between the Archbishop of <i>Roan</i> and the Monks of <i>St. Owen</i> , <i>ibid.</i> | |
| The Council of <i>Roan</i> , in 1074. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Lillebonne</i> in 1080. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Councils of the Province of <i>Aquitaine</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Narbonne</i> held in the Year 1054. | 260. |
| —Of <i>Toulouse</i> in 1056. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Councils of <i>Germany</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Dortmund</i> held A. D. 1005. | 261. |
| —Of <i>Selgenstadt</i> in 1053. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Mentz</i> in 1069. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Mentz</i> 1071. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Erford</i> in 1073. | 262. |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| The Councils of <i>England</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Aenham</i> held in the Year 1010. | 262. |
| King <i>Ethelred</i> and King <i>Canut's</i> <i>Laws</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>London</i> in 1075. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Winchester</i> in 1076. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>London</i> in 1102. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Councils of <i>Spain</i> . | |
| The Council of <i>Leon</i> held in the Year 1012. | 263. |
| —Of <i>Coyaco</i> in 1050. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| —Of <i>Elma</i> in <i>Rouffillon</i> in 1065. | 264. |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| CHAP. XIV. Observations on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Eleventh Century, | 263. |
| The Study of Divinity in this Century, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Of the Rights of the Popes and of the Church of <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Divers Points of Discipline concerning the Clergy, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Remarks on the scourging Discipline and Fasts | 265. |
| Observations on the Mass, and on divers Points of Discipline, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| On the Monastick Life, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Order of <i>Camaldolites</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Of <i>Carthusian</i> Monks, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Of <i>St. Antony</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Of <i>Cistercian</i> Friars, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Of Regular Canons, | <i>ibid.</i> |

Of the Twelfth Century.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| CHAP. I. Of the Life and Writings of <i>Ivo</i> Bishop of <i>Chartres</i> , Page 266. | |
| The Life of <i>Ivo</i> of <i>Chartres</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| His Letters, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| His Pannormia or Decretal, | 278. |
| His Sermons, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Chronicon ascribed to <i>Ivo</i> of <i>Chartres</i> , | 279. |
| The Editions of his Works, | <i>ibid.</i> |

| | |
|--|--------------|
| CHAP. II. An Account of the Church of <i>Rome</i> under the Pontificate of Pope <i>Paschal</i> II. <i>Gelasius</i> II. and <i>Calixtus</i> II. containing the Rise, Progress, and Conclusion of the Contests between the Holy See and the Empire about Investitures, | 279. |
| The Election of Pope <i>Paschal</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Death of <i>Guibert</i> , the Antipope who succeeded him, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The designs of Pope <i>Paschal</i> II. against the Emperor <i>Henry</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Rome</i> under <i>Paschal</i> II. against the Emperor <i>Henry</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Henry</i> V. rebels against his Father, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Convent of <i>Northusa</i> , in the Year 1105. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The War between the two <i>Henries</i> , 280. | |

| | |
|---|--------------|
| <i>Henry</i> IV. is cast into Prison and depos'd, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Henries</i> IV. retires to <i>Liege</i> , and there publishes a Declaration, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Reply of his Son <i>Henry</i> to this Declaration, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Death of <i>Henry</i> IV. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Guaftalla</i> in the Year 1106. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The contest between the Pope and the Emperor about Investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Reasons alledged by the Deputies of the Emperor for investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Reasons alledged by the Popes Deputies, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The breaking off of the Conference about investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Troyes</i> in the Year 1117. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Emperor's Journey into <i>Italy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Treaty between the Pope and the Emperor, | 281. |
| The Pope and Cardinals arrested by the Emperor's Order, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Pope grants the Right of investitures to the Emperor, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Emperor's return into <i>Germany</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The grant of investitures disapproved of by the Cardinals, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Lateran Council in the Year 1112. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Decrees against <i>Henry</i> upon the account of investitures, | 282. |
| The second Journey of <i>Henry</i> V. into <i>Italy</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Lateran Council held in the Year 1116. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Henry</i> enters <i>Rome</i> : <i>Paschal</i> withdraws, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Paschal</i> returns to <i>Rome</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Gelasius</i> II. elected Pope, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Henry</i> comes to <i>Rome</i> , and causes <i>Mauritius Burdin</i> to be proclaimed Pope, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Election of <i>Calixtus</i> II. | 283. |
| The Conference of the Emperor with <i>William</i> of <i>Champignons</i> about investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Council of <i>Rheims</i> in the Year 1119. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Pope's Negotiation with the Emperor, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Canons of the Council of <i>Rheims</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Calixtus</i> II. is received into <i>Rome</i> , and <i>Burdin</i> deposted with disgrace, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Treaty betwixt <i>Calixtus</i> II. and <i>Henry</i> V. about investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Rise and Progress of investitures, | 284. |
| The Ceremonies of investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The beginning of the contest about investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The state of the Question in the time of <i>Paschal</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The state of it under <i>Calixtus</i> II. | 285. |
| Remarks upon the Treaty concluded between <i>Calixtus</i> II. and <i>Henry</i> V. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Execution of the Treaty made with <i>Henry</i> , | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Custom of <i>France</i> , with respect to investitures, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Custom in <i>England</i> , with respect to the same, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| Investitures granted to particular Princes, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The first general Lateran Council in the Year 1123, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letters of <i>Paschal</i> II. | 286. |
| The Letters of <i>Gelasius</i> II. | 287. |
| The Letters of <i>Calixtus</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| CHAP. III. The History and Letters of the Popes <i>Honorius</i> II. <i>Innocent</i> II. <i>Celestine</i> II. <i>Lucius</i> II. <i>Eugenius</i> III. | 288. |
| <i>Honorius</i> II, | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Innocent</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Celestine</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Lucius</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| <i>Eugenius</i> III. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letters of <i>Honorius</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letters of <i>Innocent</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letters of <i>Celestine</i> II. | <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Letters of <i>Lucius</i> II. | 289. |
| The Letters of <i>Eugenius</i> III. | 290. |
| The Letters of <i>Anacletus</i> II. the Antipope. | 291. |

The CONTENTS.

| | |
|---|-------|
| CHAP. IV. The Life of St. Bernard, together with an account of his Writings, | 291. |
| The Letters of St. Bernard, | 292. |
| St. Bernard's Treatise of consideration, | 306. |
| His Treatise of the Duties of Bishops, | 307. |
| His Treatise of the Commandments and Dispensations, | ibid. |
| His Apology to William Abbot of St. Thierry, | 309. |
| His Treatise in commendation of the new Militia, | 310. |
| His Treatise of the Degrees of Humility, | ibid. |
| His Treatise of the Love of God, | ibid. |
| His Treatise of Grace and Free-Will, | 312. |
| His Letters to Hugh of St. Victor, | ibid. |
| The Life of St. Malachy by St. Bernard, | ibid. |
| St. Bernard's Sermons, | ibid. |
| Gilbert Abbot of Hoiland, | 312. |
| William Abbot of St. Thierry, | 311. |
| Geoffrey Abbot of Igny, | ibid. |
| Guigue Prior of the great Chartres, Author of the Ladder of the Cloyster, | ibid. |
| The Works of those Anonymous Authors which are to be met with among those of St. Bernard, | ibid. |
| The Works of Guerrick Abbot of Igny, | ib. |
| The Lives of St. Bernard, | ibid. |
| The Works of Geoffrey, St. Bernard's Disciple, | ibid. |
| The History of St. Bernard's Miracles, | ibid. |
| Other Lives of St. Bernard, | ibid. |
| Nicholas Monk of Clairvaux, | ibid. |
| The Character and Judgment upon St. Bernard, | 313. |
| The several Editions of his Works, | ibid. |
| CHAP. V. Of the Life and Writings of Peter surnamed the Venerable, Abbot of Cluny, | 313. |
| An Account of the Heresies which prevailed in the twelfth Century, | 317. |
| The Hereticks of the twelfth Century, | 318. |
| An account of the Heretick Henry, | ibid. |
| The Errors of Peter of Bruis, | ibid. |
| The Publication of the Errors of Henry, and Peter of Bruis, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks of Perigieux, | ibid. |
| The Heresie of Tanhelene, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks of Cologne, | 319. |
| The Hereticks of Toul, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks in Italy called Cathari, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks called Passagians, | ibid. |
| The Heresie of Arnold of Bresse, | 320. |
| The Condemnation of the Hereticks in the Council of Toulouse in the year 1119, | ibid. |
| Their Condemnation in the Synod of Oxford, in the Year 1160, | ibid. |
| Their Condemnations in the Council of Tours, in the year 1163, | ibid. |
| The Council of Lombes, in the year 1176, against the Hereticks, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks Condemned at Toulouse, | ibid. |
| The Condemnation of the Albigenes in the Lateran Council, in the year 1179, | 321. |
| The Heresie of Terrick, | ibid. |
| The Hereticks called Publicans or Pobllicans, | ibid. |
| The Errors Eon de P'etoile, | ibid. |
| C. H. A. P. VI. An account of Peter Abaelard, his Writings, Errors and Condemnation, | 321. |
| The Life and Adventures of Abaelard, | 321. |
| The Council of Soissons, in the year 1121, | 322. |
| The Letter of Heloissa to Abaelard, | 323. |
| The Letter of Abaelard to Heloissa, | ibid. |
| Another Letter of Heloissa, | ibid. |
| Abaelard's Reply, | ibid. |
| Abaelard's Letters, | 324. |
| The Charge brought against Peter Abaelard, | ibid. |
| The Decrees of the Council of Sens, in | |

| | |
|--|-------|
| the Year 1140. against Peter Abaelard, | 325. |
| The Pope's Confirmation of the Judgment passed by the Council of Sens, | ibid. |
| Abaelard's Apology, | ibid. |
| The Retreat of Abaelard to Cluny, and his Death, | 326. |
| The Examination of Abaelard's Doctrine, the Works of Abaelard, | 328. |
| C H A P. VIII. The History of the Errors and Condemnation of Gilbert de la Porree, Bishop of Poitiers, | 329. |
| The particular Opinions of Gilbert de la Porree, | ibid. |
| The Council of Paris, in the Year 1147, about him, | ibid. |
| The Council of Rheims in the year, 1148, | ibid. |
| The Condemnation of Gilbert in the Council of Rheims, | ibid. |
| The Writings of Gilbert de la Porree, | 330. |
| His Letter about the Eucharist, | ibid. |
| C H A P. IX. The History and Letters of the Popes who sat upon the Papal Chair, from Eugenius III. to the end of this Century, | 331. |
| Anastasius IV. | ibid. |
| Adrian IV. | ibid. |
| Alexander III. | ibid. |
| The Council of Pavia, in the year, 1160, against Alexander, | ibid. |
| The Kings of France and England declare for Alexander, | ibid. |
| The Assembly of Lodi, in the year, 1161. ib. | |
| Alexander III. goes into France, | 332. |
| A Conference at Avignon, upon the Subject of Schism, | ibid. |
| The Council of Tours held by Alexander, in the year 1163. | ibid. |
| Alexander III. returns to Rome, | ibid. |
| The Assembly of Wirtzburg, in the year 1166, against Alexander, | ibid. |
| The War of the Emperor Frederick in Italy, | ibid. |
| Peace concluded between Frederick and Alexander, | 333. |
| Lucius III. | ibid. |
| Urban III. | ibid. |
| The Assembly of Geinlenhausen, in the year 1186. | ibid. |
| Gregory VIII. | ibid. |
| Clement III. | ibid. |
| Celestine III. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Anastasius IV. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Adrian IV. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Alexander III. | 334. |
| The Letters of Lucius III. | 335. |
| The Letters of Urban III. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Gregory VIII. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Clement III. | ibid. |
| The Letters of Celestine III. | ibid. |
| C H A P. X. An account of the Contests between Thomas Becket Archbishop of Canterbury, and Henry II. King of England, | 336. |
| The Life of St. Thomas, before he was Archbishop of Canterbury, | ibid. |
| The Election of St. Thomas to the Archbishoprick of Canterbury, | ibid. |
| The Original of the Contests, between the King of England and St. Thomas, | ibid. |
| The Assembly of London in the year, 1163. ib. | |
| The Convention at Clarendon, in the year 1164. | ibid. |
| St. Thomas repents his having signed at the Assembly of Clarendon, | 337. |
| The Retreat of St. Thomas, | ibid. |
| The Negotiation of the King of England, with the Pope, | ibid. |
| The Assembly at Northampton against St. Thomas, | ibid. |
| The Archbishop withdraws into France, | ibid. |
| The Judgment of the Pope in favour of St. Thomas, | 338. |
| St. Thomas is sent Legate of the Holy See into England, | ibid. |
| The Negotiation of John of Oxford at Rome, | ibid. |
| The Negotiation of the Pope's Legate, sent into England. | ibid. |

| | |
|---|-------|
| An interview of St. Thomas and the Kings of England, in the presence of the King of France, | 339. |
| Other Legates sent into England, and their Negotiation, | ibid. |
| The King of England's Son is Crowned by the Archbishop of York, | ibid. |
| The Accommodation between the King and St. Thomas, | 340. |
| The Return of St. Thomas into England, | ibid. |
| Fresh Disturbances, | ibid. |
| The Plot against the Life of St. Thomas, and his Death, | ibid. |
| The Canonization of St. Thomas, | ibid. |
| His Writings, | ibid. |
| Chap. XI. The Lives and Writings of the most Eminent Authors, who flourished in the Twelfth Century, | 341. |
| Geoffrey Abbot of Vendome, | ibid. |
| Hildebert Bishop of Mans, and afterwards Archbishop of Tours, | 343. |
| Guibert Abbot of Nogent, | 345. |
| Sigebert Monk of Gemblours, | 347. |
| Honorius Solitarius, the School-master of the Church of Autun, | 348. |
| Ernulfus or Arnulfus Bishop of Rochester, | 349. |
| St. Bruno and Guigue, Priors of the Carthusian Monastery at Grenoble, | 350. |
| St. Norbert, | ibid. |
| Stephen Harding, Abbot of Cisteraux, | ibid. |
| Bruno Bishop of Signi, | 351. |
| Odo a Benedictine of Asti, | ibid. |
| Marbodius Bishop of Rennes, | ibid. |
| Arnulfus or Arnald, Bishop of Lisieux, | 352. |
| Peter de Celles Bishop of Chartres, | 353. |
| Nicholas Monk of St. Albans, | ibid. |
| John of Salisbury, Bishop of Chartres, | 356. |
| Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of Bath, | ibid. |
| Stephen Bishop of Tournay, | 361. |
| The Authors who have written against the Albigenes and Waldenses, | 363. |
| Ebrard of Bethune, | ibid. |
| Bernard Abbot of Fontcaud, | ibid. |
| Emengard or Ermengand, | ibid. |
| Chap. XII. Of the Ecclesiastical Authors of lesser Note who flourished in the West during this Century, | 364. |
| Anselm Dean of Laon, | ibid. |
| Gislebert or Gilbert Crispin Abbot of Westminster, | ibid. |
| Peter Alphonso a Spanish converted Jew, | ibid. |
| Theobald Clerk of the Church at Etampes, | ibid. |
| Radulphus or Ralph the Zealous, | ibid. |
| Odo Bishop of Cambrai, | ibid. |
| Gilbert Bishop of Limerick, | ibid. |
| Franco Abbot of Afflighem, | ibid. |
| William of Champeaux Bishop of Chalons, | ibid. |
| Stephen Bishop of Autun, | 365. |
| Gautier Bishop of Maguelone, | ibid. |
| Drogo or Dreux, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, | ibid. |
| Peter, the Library-keeper of Mount Cassin, | ibid. |
| Richard Abbot of Mount Cassin, | ibid. |
| Anselm Bishop of Havelberg, | ibid. |
| Herveus a Benedictine of Dol, | ibid. |
| Hugh de Foliet Monk of Corbey, | ibid. |
| Stephen Bishop of Paris, | ibid. |
| Hugh Archbishop of Roan, | ibid. |
| Hugh Metellus a Regular Canon, | 366. |
| Thomas Abbot of Maurigny, | ibid. |
| Bernard Monk of Cluny, | ibid. |
| Ulgier Bishop of Angiers, | ibid. |
| Rodulphus Abbot of St. Tron, | ibid. |
| Sibert Prior of St. Pantaleon, | ibid. |
| Wascelinus Momalius Prior of St. Lawrence of Liege, | ibid. |
| Amedeus Bishop of Laufanna, | ibid. |
| Patho Monk of Prom, | ibid. |
| Philip Bishop of Tarento, | ibid. |
| Serlo Monk of Cerisy, and afterwards Abbot of Savigny, | 367. |
| Gautier of Mauritania Bishop of Laon, | ibid. |
| Wolbero Abbot of St. Pantaleon, | ibid. |
| Luke Abbot of St. Corneille near Liege, | ibid. |
| Bartholomew of Foigny Bishop of Laon, | ibid. |

The C O N T E N T S.

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Ralph the Black Monk of St. Germer, <i>ibid.</i> | An Anonymous Author, <i>ibid.</i> | Lucas Chrysobergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, <i>ibid.</i> |
| St. Adrede or Ashelred Abbot of Reverbry, <i>ibid.</i> | Oliver of Cologne, <i>ibid.</i> | Michael of Thessalonica, <i>ibid.</i> |
| St. Hildegarda Abbess of Mount St. Robert, <i>ibid.</i> | Author of Chronicles and particular Histories, <i>ibid.</i> | Alexis Aristenes, Steward of the Church of Constantinople, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Thierry Abbot of the Order of St. Benedict, <i>ibid.</i> | Hugh Abbot of Flavigny, <i>ibid.</i> | Simeon Logothetes, <i>ibid.</i> |
| St. Elizabeth Abbess of Schonau, <i>ibid.</i> | Baudry Bishop of Noyon and Terouane, <i>ibid.</i> | John Cinnam the Grammarian, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Ecbert Abbot of St. Florin, <i>ibid.</i> | Leo of Marf, Cardinal Bishop of Ostia, <i>ibid.</i> | Theorianus, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Odo a Regular Canon, <i>ibid.</i> | Leo Cardinal Deacon, 375. | Hugh Etherlanus, <i>ibid.</i> |
| John of Cornwall, <i>ibid.</i> | Harimphus Monk of St. Riquier, <i>ibid.</i> | Nicephorus Bryennius the Macedonian, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Folmar Provost of Triffenstein, <i>ibid.</i> | Rainier Monk of St. Lawrence of Liege, <i>ibid.</i> | Anna Comnena, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gerocus Provost of Reichersperg, <i>ibid.</i> | Herman Abbot of St. Martin of Tournay, <i>ibid.</i> | John Zonaras, Secretary of State of Constantinople, <i>ibid.</i> |
| An Anonymous Dean of Reichersperg, 368. | Falco Magistrate of St. Benevento, <i>ibid.</i> | John Phocas a Greek Monk, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gilbert Foliot Bishop of London, <i>ibid.</i> | Udaschalbus Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | Neophytus a Recluse Monk, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Philip of Harvange Abbot of Bonne Esperance, <i>ibid.</i> | Alexander Abbot in Sicily, <i>ibid.</i> | John Bishop of Lydda, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Adam the Scot, a Regular Canon, <i>ibid.</i> | John Monk of Marmoutier, <i>ibid.</i> | George Xiphilin, Patriarch of Constantinople, <i>ibid.</i> |
| John the Burgundian Magistrate of Pifa, <i>ibid.</i> | Geofrey or Walter of Vineauf, <i>ibid.</i> | Demetrius Tornicius, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Peter of Riga Canon of Rheims, <i>ibid.</i> | Ode of Devil Abbot of St. Corneille at Compeigne, <i>ibid.</i> | Lupus Protospathus, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Henry Archbishop of Rheims, <i>ibid.</i> | Lawrence Monk of Liege, <i>ibid.</i> | Michael Anchialius, Patriarch of Constantinople, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Robert Paululus Priest of Amiens, <i>ibid.</i> | Sugerus Abbot of St. Denis, <i>ibid.</i> | Theodorus Balsamon Patriarch of Antioch, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Maurice of Sully Bishop of Paris, <i>ibid.</i> | Adelbert or Albert, Abbot of Hildesheim, <i>ibid.</i> | John Camaterus, Patriarch of Constantinople, 379. |
| Gervaise Priest of Chichester, <i>ibid.</i> | Teulfus Monk of Maurigny, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Odo Abbot of Bell, <i>ibid.</i> | Hugh of Poitiers, Monk of Vezelay, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XV. Of the Original of Scholastic Divinity, and of the first School-Men who flourish'd in the Twelfth Century, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Laborantius a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> | Richard Prior of Hagulfstad, <i>ibid.</i> | Peter Lombard Bishop of Paris, 380. |
| Alulphus Monk of St. Martin at Tournay, <i>ibid.</i> | Thierry a Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | Robert Pullus Cardinal, 384. |
| Baldwin Archbishop of Canterbury, <i>ibid.</i> | An Anonymous Author of the Danish Expedition into the Holy Land, <i>ibid.</i> | Peter of Poitiers, Chancellor of the Church of Paris, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Haac Abbot of de l'Ecole, <i>ibid.</i> | Geofrey Prior of Vigoris, <i>ibid.</i> | Robert of Melun, Bishop of Hereford, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Thierry, Peter and Garnier Abbots of Clairvaux, <i>ibid.</i> | Gonthier Monk of St. Amand, <i>ibid.</i> | Gautier, Regular Canon of St. Victor, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Gilbert of Sempringham, <i>ibid.</i> | Saxe the Grammarian Provost of Roschild, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Christian Monk of Clairvaux, <i>ibid.</i> | Ralph of Diceto, Dean of St. Paul's in London, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XVI. Of the Commentaries on the Holy Scriptures, compos'd in the Twelfth Century, and of the three famous Commentators, viz. Rupert Abbot of Dwyts, Hugh and Richard of St. Victor. 385. |
| Gautier of Chasillon, 369. | Authors of the Lives of the Saints, and of the Relations of their Miracles, <i>ibid.</i> | The new Method of Commenting on the Holy Scriptures, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Garnier of St. Victor, <i>ibid.</i> | Anscherus Abbot of St. Riquier, 734. | Rupert Abbot of Dwyts, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Thomas Monk of Cisteraux, <i>ibid.</i> | Theofredus Abbot of Epternach, <i>ibid.</i> | Hugh of St. Victor, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Peter Comestor Dean of St. Peter of Troyes, <i>ibid.</i> | Reginald of Senur, Archbishop of Lyons, <i>ibid.</i> | Richard of St. Victor, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Robert of Flambesbury, <i>ibid.</i> | Nicholas Monk of Soissons, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Bartholomew Bishop of Oxford, <i>ibid.</i> | Domniso an Italian Priest, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XVII. Of the Collection of Canons made by Gratian, 378. |
| Odo of Chiron, <i>ibid.</i> | Aelnothus Monk of Canterbury, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XVIII. Of the General Councils held in the Twelfth Century, 388. |
| Elias of Coxie, Abbot of Dunes, <i>ibid.</i> | Gualbert Monk of Marchiennes, <i>ibid.</i> | The first general Lateran Council, <i>ibid.</i> |
| John a Monk of Charteux des Portes, <i>ibid.</i> | Pandulfus of Pifa, <i>ibid.</i> | The second general Lateran Council, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Stephen de Chaulmet, Charteux des Portes, <i>ibid.</i> | Fabricius Tuscus Abbot of Abbingdon, <i>ibid.</i> | The third general Lateran Council, 389. |
| Zachariah Bishop of Chrysopolis, <i>ibid.</i> | Aulfus Abbot of the Order of Valombrosa, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XIX. Of the Provincial Councils held in the Twelfth Century, 390. |
| | Odo Abbot of St. Remy of Rheims, <i>ibid.</i> | Valence in the Year 1100, 391. |
| CHAP. XIII. Of the Authors of the Twelfth Century, who have compos'd any pieces of Ecclesiastical History, 370. | Geofrey the Gross, Monk of Tiron, <i>ibid.</i> | Poitiers in the Year 1100, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Authors who have written the Universal History, <i>ibid.</i> | Ulric Bishop of Constance, <i>ibid.</i> | Anse the same Year, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Florentius Bravo Monk of Winchester, <i>ibid.</i> | Archard Monk of Clairvaux, <i>ibid.</i> | Troyes in the Year 1104, 392. |
| Eckard Abbot of Urangen, <i>ibid.</i> | Sifred Ebbo, Thimon and Herbard, <i>ibid.</i> | Beauvais in the Year 1114, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Hugh Monk of Fleury, <i>ibid.</i> | Robert Archdeacon of Ostrevant, <i>ibid.</i> | Rheims in the Year 1115, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Ordericus Vitalis Monk of St. Evrou, <i>ibid.</i> | An Anonymous Author of the Life of St. Ludger, <i>ibid.</i> | Toulouse in the Year 1119, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Anselm Abbot of Gemblours, <i>ibid.</i> | Turstin Archbishop of York, <i>ibid.</i> | London in the Year 1125, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Otho Bishop of Frisinghen, <i>ibid.</i> | Thibald Monk of St. Peter of Beze, <i>ibid.</i> | London in the Year 1127, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Geofrey of Viterbo, <i>ibid.</i> | Hugh Monk of Cluny, <i>ibid.</i> | London in the Year 1138, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Robert de Torigny Abbot of Mount St. Michael, <i>ibid.</i> | Gautier Canon of Terouane, <i>ibid.</i> | Rheims in the Year 1131, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Otho of St. Blaise, <i>ibid.</i> | Nicholas Canon of Liege, <i>ibid.</i> | Rheims in the Year 1148, 393. |
| John Brompton Abbot of Jorual, <i>ibid.</i> | Alanus Bishop of Auxerre, <i>ibid.</i> | Tours in the Year 1163, <i>ibid.</i> |
| English Historians, <i>ibid.</i> | Sibrand Abbot of Marienarde, <i>ibid.</i> | Cassal in Ireland in the Year 1172, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Henry Archdeacon of Huntington, 371. | Gerard Abbot de la Chaise-Dieu, <i>ibid.</i> | Auranches the same Year, <i>ibid.</i> |
| William the little, called Guilielmus Nembrigenfis, <i>ibid.</i> | Radulphus Tortarius, <i>ibid.</i> | London in the Year 1175, 394. |
| Walter Archdeacon of Oxford, <i>ibid.</i> | Stephen Abbot of St. James of Liege, <i>ibid.</i> | The Synod of York in the Year 1195, <i>ibid.</i> |
| John Pyke, <i>ibid.</i> | Hugh Monk of St. Saviour of Lodeve, <i>ibid.</i> | The Council of Montpellier the same Year, 395. |
| Gervais Monk of Canterbury, <i>ibid.</i> | Herman a Convert Jew of Cologne, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Geofrey Arthur Bishop of St. Asaph, <i>ibid.</i> | Thomas Monk of Ely, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XX. Observations on the Ecclesiastical Affairs of the Twelfth Century, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Turgot Monk of Durham, <i>ibid.</i> | | Of the Authority of the Popes, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Simeon of Durham, <i>ibid.</i> | CHAP. XIV. The Lives and Writings of the Ecclesiastical Authors of the East during the Twelfth Century, 375. | Several Points of Discipline relating to the Clergy, <i>ibid.</i> |
| William of Somerset, Monk of Malmesbury, <i>ibid.</i> | Euthymius Zigabenus, a Grecian Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | Remarks on the Discipline of the Sacraments, <i>ibid.</i> |
| John of Hexam, Provost of Hagulfstad, <i>ibid.</i> | Philip the Solitary, a Greek Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | Remarks on the Monastical State, 396. |
| Silvester Girald, Bishop of St. Davids, <i>ibid.</i> | Peter Crofolan or Chrysolanus, <i>ibid.</i> | Regular Canons, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Roger of Hoveden, Professor at Oxford, <i>ibid.</i> | Euftratus Archbishop of Nice, <i>ibid.</i> | Military Orders, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Historiographers of the Croisades, <i>ibid.</i> | Nicetus Seidus, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Peter Theuthbodus, <i>ibid.</i> | Isaac an Armenian Bishop, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| An Anonymous Italian, <i>ibid.</i> | Michael Glycas, a Sicilian, 376. | |
| Robert Monk of St. Remy of Rheims, 374. | Nicetas Constantinopolitanus, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Baudry Bishop of Dol, <i>ibid.</i> | Constantine Manaffes, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Raymond of Agiles, Canon of Puy, <i>ibid.</i> | Constantine Harmenoplus, Judge of Thessalonica, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Albert or Alberic, Canon of Aix, <i>ibid.</i> | John Patriarch of Antioch, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Foucher Monk of Chartres, <i>ibid.</i> | German Patriarch of Constantinople, 377. | |
| Gautier the Chantellor, <i>ibid.</i> | Arsenius Monk of Mount Athos, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| Two Anonymous Abbreviators of Foucher, <i>ibid.</i> | Andronicus Camaterus, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| William Archbishop of Tyre, <i>ibid.</i> | George Archbishop of Corfu, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| James of Vitry Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> | Anthony Melissus a Greek Monk, <i>ibid.</i> | |
| | Basil of Acris, Archbishop of Thessalonica, <i>ibid.</i> | |

The CONTENTS.

Of the Thirteenth Century.

| | | | | |
|---|---|-------|--|-------|
| Chap. I. The History of the different Revolutions in the Empire and Italy, during the Thirteenth Century 396 | Gilbert Abbot of Gemblours | ibid. | Humbert General of the Dominicans | ibid. |
| Contests about the Empire between Philip and Otto | Hervardus Archdeacon of Leige | ibid. | Gerard of Frachet Preaching Friar | ibid. |
| Otto acknowledged Emperor | William of Segnelay Bishop of Paris | ibid. | Bartholomew of Brelle Professor of the Canon Law | ibid. |
| Otto goes into Italy and makes War there | Robert of Corceon | ibid. | Godfrey the Bald Archbishop of Bourges | ibid. |
| Sentence of Excommunication against him | Alanus of Lisle, the Universal Doctor | ibid. | William Monk of St. Martin of Tournay | ibid. |
| Frederick elected Emperor and goes into Germany | Simon a Priest of Tournay | ibid. | Giles Monk of Orval | ibid. |
| Crown'd Emperor by Honorius III. | Peter of Corbeil Archbishop of Sens | ibid. | Bernard of Compostella Chaplain to Innocent IV. | ibid. |
| But differing with the Pope, is also excommunicated | Abfalom Abbot of Spinkerbac | ibid. | Conrade a German Bishop | ibid. |
| Pope Honorius dies, and is succeeded by Gregory IX. | Wernerus Abbot of St. Blaise | ibid. | Albert General of the Friars Minors | ibid. |
| Frederick departs for the Holy Land | Tagenon Dean of Pavia | ibid. | Alberick Verus Canon Regular of St. Augustin | ibid. |
| Gregory excommunicates him | An Anonymous Historian | ibid. | Walter Bishop of Poitiers | ibid. |
| Frederick makes Peace with the Pope | Walter Archbishop of Roan, William the Pilgrim, and Richard Canon of London | ibid. | Roger Historiographer of Hungary | ibid. |
| Henry his Son, whom he had caused to be chosen King of Germany, revolts from him | Albert Patriarch of Jerusalem | 427 | Constantine of Orvieto | ibid. |
| Frederick wars again with the Pope | Dodechin Abbot of St. Disibode | ibid. | Engelbert Abbot of the Cistercian Order | ibid. |
| The Sentence of Pope Gregory against him | Andreas Sylvius Abbot of Marchiennes | ibid. | Robert Rich and Robert Bacon | ibid. |
| The Opinion of the French upon the Deposition of Frederick | Baldwin Emperor of Constantinople | ibid. | John de Dieu Canon of Bologna | ibid. |
| The Death of Gregory, and the Election of Celestin IV. and Innocent IV. | Geoffrey of Villehardwin | ibid. | John Colonna Archbishop of Messina | ibid. |
| A General Council at Lyons in 1245 where in the Pope complains of the Emperor | Gonthier a Monk of Paris in the Diocese of Basil | ibid. | Anonymous Author of the Life of St. Clare | 436 |
| Frederick's Defence | Arnold Abbot of Lubeck | ibid. | Rainier Sachon Friar Preacher | ibid. |
| The Landgrave of Thuringen and Earl of Holand, chosen Emperors by some of the Princes of Germany | Gervais of Tilbury | ibid. | Matthew Paris Monk of St. Albans | ibid. |
| The Death of Frederick | Walter Mapes Archdeacon of Oxford | ibid. | William of Rishauger | ibid. |
| The Government of Manfred in Sicily | Wilbrandus of Oldenburg Canon of Hildesheim | ibid. | Henry Susa Cardinal Bishop of Ostia | ibid. |
| Troubles in the Empire and Sicily | Robert and Hugh Canons Regular of St. Marian of Auxerre | ibid. | John Semeca Provost of Halberstadt | ibid. |
| The Election of Alphonfus, and Richard Earl of Cornwall, Emperors | Lambert of Liege Monk of St. Laurence of Duitz | ibid. | Anonymous Author of the Life of Godebert | ibid. |
| Charles Earl of Anjou defeats Manfred, and makes himself Master of Italy | Anonymous | ibid. | John of Parma General of the Friars Minors | ibid. |
| Conradin disputes the Kingdom of Sicily with Charles | Peter Monk of the Valleys of Cernay | ibid. | John Christophle Preaching Friar | ibid. |
| Defeated and put to Death | William of Puilaurent | ibid. | Robert of Sorbonne | ibid. |
| The Election of Rodolphus to the Empire, and his Actions | John of Oxford Dean of Salisbury | ibid. | Hannibal of Annebaud Cardinal | ibid. |
| Charles of Anjou despoil'd of his Authority by the Pope | John Abbot of Fordeham | ibid. | John de Galles Friar Minor | 437 |
| Sicily rebels against Charles | Joceline Brakelonde Monk of Uske | ibid. | John Genes a Franciscan | ibid. |
| The Sicilian Vespers | John Gray Bishop of Norwich | ibid. | William of Sanwic a Carmelite | ibid. |
| The Defeat of Charles and his Death | Hugh White Monk of Peterburg | ibid. | William Guarron Friar Minor | ibid. |
| The Division of the Kingdom of Sicily | Prepositivus a Divine of Paris | ibid. | Thomas Spott, and William Thorn English Monks | ibid. |
| The Reign of Adolphus | Celarius of Heisterbac Prior of Villiers | ibid. | Thomas of Lentini Archbishop of Cosenza | ibid. |
| He is deposed | Stephen of Langton Cardinal | ibid. | Martin a Polander, Archbishop of Gnesna | ibid. |
| Election of Albert D. of Austria | Alexander Neckham Abbot of Exeter | 428 | Nicholas of Hanaps Patriarch of Jerusalem | ibid. |
| Chap. II. The Life and Letters of Pope Innocent the Third | Helinand Monk of Froimont | ibid. | Bonaventure Brocard Friar Preacher | ibid. |
| The Life of Pope Innocent | Conrade of Lichtenau Abbot of Ursburg | ibid. | Mark Paul a Venetian | ibid. |
| His Letters | St. Francis of Assisi | ibid. | Matthew of Vendosme Abbot of St. Denis | ibid. |
| Chap. III. The History and Writings of the Popes, from the Death of Innocent III. to the End of this Century | St. Anthony of Padua | ibid. | Geoffrey of Beaulieu Confessor to St. Lewis | ibid. |
| Honorius III. | Ricerius Companion of St. Francis | ibid. | John Peckham Archbishop of Canterbury | ibid. |
| Collections of the Pope's Decretals | Roderick Ximenes Archbishop of Toledo | ibid. | William Durants Bishop of Menda | ibid. |
| Gregory IX. | Henry Abbot of Richenou | ibid. | Two Anonymous Authors Friars Preachers | 438 |
| Celestin IV. | Conrade Prior of Schur | ibid. | John de Hayde | ibid. |
| Alexander IV. | Ekerard Dean of St. Gall | ibid. | William de la Mare Friar Minor | ibid. |
| Urban IV. | William Monk of St. Denis | ibid. | Rupert or Robert of Russia Friar Minor | ibid. |
| Clement IV. | Rigord Historiographer of France | ibid. | Ulric of Strasburg Preaching Friar | ibid. |
| Gregory X. | William of Nangis | ibid. | St. Gertrude and St. Matilda Benedictine Nuns | ibid. |
| Institution of the Conclave | Fabian Hugelin a Friar Minor | ibid. | Thierry of Apolda Preaching Friar | ibid. |
| Innocent V. | Conrade Abbot of Everbak | ibid. | Gobelin and Egehard Abbots of Urangen | ibid. |
| Adrian V. | John Gale Abbot of Fontenelle | ibid. | Conrade a German, Friar Preacher | ibid. |
| John XXI. | Albert Prior of Mont de Vignes | ibid. | Stephenard a Divine of Milan | ibid. |
| Nicholas III. | Two Anonymous Authors | ibid. | Ralph of Colonna Canon of Chartres | ibid. |
| Martin IV. | Maurice Archbishop of Roan | ibid. | Thomas Palmeran Doctor of Sorbon | ibid. |
| Honorius IV. | William Abbot of Andres | ibid. | Guy de Baif Archdeacon of Bouloug | ibid. |
| Nicholas IV. | John Algrin of Abbeville Cardinal | ibid. | Gregory Cairguent an English Benedictine Monk | ibid. |
| Celestin V. | Jordan General of the Preaching Friars | ibid. | Raimond des Martins Preaching Friar | ibid. |
| Chap. IV. The Lives and Writings of the Authors that flourished in the West in the Thirteenth Century | Walter Cornu Archbishop of Sens | 429 | Nicholas the Gaul General of the Carmelites | ibid. |
| A Judgment upon the Works of the Authors of this Age | Gerard Monk of St. Quentin | ibid. | Sigard Monk of St. Albans | ibid. |
| Joachim Abbot of Flora | Hugh Regular Canon of Premontre | ibid. | Matthew d' Aquasporta Cardinal | ibid. |
| John Beletia Doctor of Paris | Conrade of Marpurg | ibid. | Arlott General of the Franciscans | ibid. |
| Peter the Chanter of the Church of Paris | Philip of Greve Chancellor of the University of Paris | ibid. | Luke of Padua Friar Minor | ibid. |
| | Thomas de Celano a Franciscan Friar | ibid. | Simon Monk of Afflighem | ibid. |
| | James of Vitry Cardinal | ibid. | Henry Monk of Afflighem | ibid. |
| | Luke Bishop of Tuy | ibid. | William Prior of Afflighem | ibid. |
| | Godfrey Monk of Pantaleon | ibid. | Alexander of Dol | ibid. |
| | St. Edmond Archbishop of Canterbury | ibid. | Gerard of Liege Friar Preacher | 439 |
| | Robert Grosthead Bishop of Lincoln | ibid. | Peter Provincial of the Dominicans | ibid. |
| | William Bishop of Paris | 430 | Engelhard Abbot of Lanckaim | ibid. |
| | Vincent of Beauvais a Friar Preacher | 431 | Henry of Gaunt Archdeacon of Tournay | ibid. |
| | St. Raimond of Pennafort or Rochfort | ibid. | Richard of Middleton Friar Minor | ibid. |
| | Giles of Assisi | 432 | James de Varaggio Archbishop of Genoua | ibid. |
| | John of Rochelle Franciscan Friar | ibid. | Guy de Munois Abbot of St. German de Auxerre | ibid. |
| | John of Hales | ibid. | Ptolomy of Lucca Bishop of Toricelli | ibid. |
| | Albertus Magnus Bishop of Ratisbon | ibid. | | |
| | Richard of St. Laurence | ibid. | | |
| | St. Bonaventure | ibid. | | |
| | St. Thomas Aquinas | 433 | | |
| | Hugh de St. Charus, or Theodorick, Cardinal | 434 | | |
| | Conrade of Halberstadt | ibid. | | |
| | William Perrault Preaching Friar | ibid. | | |
| | Thomas de Chantpre | ibid. | | |
| | Roger Bacon Friar Minor | 435 | | |
| | Peter des Vignes Chancellor to the Emperor Frederick II. | ibid. | | |

The CONTENTS.

| | | | | | |
|---|------------|---|--------------------|--|-------|
| John the Teutonic Bishop of Bolisna | ibid. | Compeign. | 465. 1270 | Chap. X. Ecclesiastical Observations on the Thirteenth Century. | 486 |
| Garfias a Spaniard | ibid. | Avignon. | 465. 1270 | Heretics and Errors raised in this Age. | ibid. |
| Henry or Amand Sufon Friar Preacher | ibid. | Quentin. | 465. 1271 | Establishment of the Inquisition. | ibid. |
| Walter of Exeter Friar Preacher | ibid. | Rennes. | 466. 1273 | Origin of Censures. | ibid. |
| Francis de Moncade Marquis of Ayeton | ibid. | Lyons II. General. | 466. 1274 | History of the University of Paris. | ibid. |
| Authors whose Works are only in Manuscript | ibid. | Salzburg. | 467. 1274, 1281 | Of the Authority of the Pope. | ibid. |
| Chap. V. The History of the Greek Church, and the Authors who flourished in the East during the Thirteenth Century. | 440 | Arles. | 468. 1275 | Of Election and Collation to Benefices. | ibid. |
| Projects set on Foot for the Re-union of the Greeks and Latins. | ibid. | The Synodical Statutes of Robert Bishop of Durham. | ibid. 1276 | Difference between the Mendicant Friars and the Clergy about Confession. | 487 |
| The Re-union of the Greeks and Latins under Michael Palaeologus | 441 | Saumur. | 468. 1276 | Institutions of divers Religious Orders. | ibid. |
| Rupture of that Union in the time of Andronicus. | 442 | Bourges. | 468. 1276 | The poor Catholics. | ibid. |
| The Succession of the Patriarchs of Constantinople during this Century. | ibid. | Langeis. | 468. 1278 | The Humbled. | ibid. |
| Nicholas d'Otrantes. | ibid. | Ponteau-de-Mer. | 469. 1279 | Friars Preachers. | ibid. |
| Nicetas Archbishop of Thessalonica. | ibid. | Avignon. | 469. 1282 | The Minor or Franciscan Friars. | 488 |
| Nicetas Acominatus, Choniates Logothetes. | ibid. | Reading. | 469. 1279 | Augustines. | ibid. |
| Michael Acominatus Choniates Archbishop of Athens | 443 | Buda. | 469. 1279 | Carmelites. | ibid. |
| Joel. | ibid. | Angers. | 470. 1279 | The Order for Redemption of Captives. | ibid. |
| George Acropolita Logothetes. | ibid. | The Synodical Statutes of Sifroy Archbishop of Cologne. | 471, 487. 1280 | Sylvestrines. | ibid. |
| Pantaleon Deacon of Constantinople. | ibid. | Synodical Constitutions of Geofry Bishop of Saintes. | ibid. | The Order of St. Mary of Mercy. | ibid. |
| Manuel Charitopula. | ibid. | The Constitutions of Walter Bishop of Poitiers. | ibid. | Servites. | ibid. |
| Germanus Nauplius. | ibid. | Lambeth. | 471. 1281 | Celestines. | ibid. |
| Nicephorus Blemmidas. | ibid. | Tours. | 472. 1282 | The Order of the Valley of Scholars. | ibid. |
| Arsenius Autorianus. | 444 | The Synodical Statutes of the Diocess of Nismes. | ibid. | | |
| Theodore Lascaris. | ibid. | Ravenna. | 472. 1286 | | |
| George Pachymeres. | ibid. | Bourges. | 472. 1286 | | |
| John Veccus. | ibid. | The Synodical Canons of Peter Bishop of Exeter. | 473. 1287 | | |
| George Metochita, and Constantine Meliteniota Deacon and Archdeacon of Constantinople. | ibid. | Wirtzburg. | 473. 1287 | | |
| Simon of Crete Preaching Friar. | ibid. | Lisle in Provence. | 473. 1288 | | |
| George Gregory Patriarch of Constantinople. | ibid. | The Synodical Statutes of Gilbert Bishop of Chichester. | 474. 1289 | | |
| George Moschamper Register of Constantinople. | ibid. | Nogaro. | 474. 1290 | | |
| Constantine Acropolita Logothetes, Mark and Job Isafites. | 445 | Salzburg. | 474. 1291 | | |
| Gregory Abulpharaje. | ibid. | London. | 474. 1291 | | |
| | | Saumur. | 474. 1294 | | |
| Chap. VI. Of the Councils held during the Thirteenth Century. | 445 | The Synodical Statutes of Robert of Winchester Archbishop of Canterbury. | 474. 1295, & 1300. | | |
| Sens. | 445. 1198 | The Synodical Constitutions of Guy Bishop of Saintes. | 475. 1298 | | |
| Dalmatia. | 445. 1199 | Roan. | 475. 1299 | | |
| London. | 445. 1200 | | | | |
| Lambeth. | 446. 1206 | Chap. VII. An Account of the Contests between the Divines of Paris and the Dominican Friars: And of the Writings of William de Sancto Amore. | 475 | | |
| The Constitutions of Card. Galo. | 447. 1208 | The Contests between the Divines of Paris and the Dominicans. | ibid. | | |
| Avignon. | 446. 1209 | Contests between William de Sancto Amore and the Dominicans. | 476 | | |
| Paris. | 447. 1212 | An Abridgment of the Writings of William de Sancto Amore. | 477 | | |
| Montpellier. | 448. 1215 | A Judgment on his Style and Doctrine. | 479 | | |
| Lateran IV. General. | 448. 1215 | | | | |
| Melun. | 454. 1216 | Chap. VIII. Of the Errors advanced by Amaury, Abbot Joachim, and several others, and of the Condemnation of them. | 479 | | |
| Oxford. | 454. 1222 | The Doctrine of Amaury, and his Condemnation. | 480 | | |
| Ments. | 455. 1225 | Of his Disciples. | ibid. | | |
| Narbonne. | 455. 1227 | Aristotle's Works condemn'd. | ibid. | | |
| Tholoufe. | 455. 1229 | The Opinions of Abbot Joachim. | ibid. | | |
| Chateau-Gonthier. | 456. 1231 | The Book entitul'd the Eternal Gospel. | ibid. | | |
| Beziers. | 457. 1233 | Condemnation of that Book, and its Errors. | ibid. | | |
| Arles. | 457. 1234 | Condemnation of the Joachimites in the Council of Arles. | ibid. | | |
| Narbonne. | 458. 1235 | Propositions condemn'd by William of Paris. | 481 | | |
| Tours. | 458. 1236 | Recantation of William a Franciscan Friar. | ibid. | | |
| London. | 458. 1237 | Propositions condemn'd by Stephen Templar Bishop of Paris. | ibid. | | |
| Cognac. | 463. 1238 | | | | |
| Tours. | 460. 1239 | Chap. IX. The History of the Sects of the Waldenses, Albigenses, and others; of their Doctrines, Condemnation, Adversaries: And of the Inquisitions, Crusades and Wars made against them. | 481 | | |
| Laval. | 460. 1242 | The Rise of the Sect of the Fandois or Waldens. | 482 | | |
| Lyons I. General. | ibid. 1245 | Their Opinions. | 483 | | |
| Beziers. | 461. 1246 | Several other Sects. | ibid. | | |
| Valence in Dauphine. | 461. 1248 | The Inquisition and Crusades against the Albigenses. | 184 | | |
| Saumur. | 461. 1253 | Their Opinions. | 185 | | |
| Alby. | 461. 1254 | The Treatise of Luke de Tuy against them. | ibid. | | |
| Bordeaux. | ibid. 1255 | | | | |
| Beziers. | 462. 1255 | Stadings Hereticks of Germany. | ibid. | | |
| Ruffec. | 462. 1258 | Schismatics of Germany. | ibid. | | |
| Montpellier. | 462. 1258 | Flagellantes. | ibid. | | |
| Cologne. | 462. 1260 | | | | |
| Arles. | 462. 1260 | | | | |
| Cognac. | 463. 1260 | | | | |
| Lambeth. | 463. 1261 | | | | |
| Cognac. | ibid. 1262 | | | | |
| Bordeaux. | 463. 1262 | | | | |
| Nantes. | 464. 1264 | | | | |
| Decrees of Egelbert Archbishop of Cologne. | 464. 1266 | | | | |
| Vienna in Austria. | 464. 1267 | | | | |
| London. | 464. 1268 | | | | |
| The Ordinance of St. Lewis | 465. 1268 | | | | |
| Chateau-Gonthier. | 465. 1268 | | | | |
| Angers. | 465. 1269 | | | | |
| Sens. | 465. 1269 | | | | |

Of the Fourteenth Century.

| | |
|---|-------|
| THE History of the Quarrels of Philip the Fair, King of France, and Boniface VIII. as well under the Pontificate of that Pope, and Benedict XI. his Successor, as during the Vacancy of the Holy See, and the beginning of the Papacy of Clement V. | 488 |
| The Election of Benedictus Cajetanus named Boniface VIII. | ibid. |
| The Beginning of the Broil of the Pope with that King upon the account of the Earl of Flanders. | ibid. |
| The Bull of Boniface forbidding to raise any Taxes upon the Clergy. | ibid. |
| That Kings Prohibition to carry any Silver out of his Realm. | ibid. |
| The Pope's Bull against that Prohibition. | 489 |
| The Kings Manifesto against the said Bull. | ibid. |
| The Letter of the French Bishops to the Pope about his Bull. | ibid. |
| An Embassy to continue the Truce. | ibid. |
| The Explication of the first of the Pope's Bulls. | ibid. |
| The Pope's proceedings against the Colonna, and their Condemnation. | 490 |
| Boniface's Bull in favour of the Earl of Flanders. | ibid. |
| The Appointment of a Jubilee by Boniface. | ibid. |
| Boniface quarrels afresh with the King. | ibid. |
| The Bishop of Pamiez sent to the King to whom speaking ill, he is arrested. | ibid. |
| A Bull against the King's Prerogative. | ibid. |
| Bulls about the Supremacy of the Pope, and against the Right of the Kings. | ibid. |
| An Assembly of the States against the Attempts of Boniface. | ibid. |
| The Answers of the King and States to the Pope. | 491 |
| The Replies of the Pope and Cardinals, to the King and States. | ibid. |
| Writings against the Pretences of the Pope. | ibid. |
| The Petition of William de Nogaret against the Pope. | ibid. |
| The Publication of the Bull Unam Sanctam. | 492 |
| The Propositions of Cardinal Lemoine, the Pope's Nuncio in France. | ibid. |
| The Kings Answer to the Articles proposed by the Nuncio. | ibid. |
| Bulls against the King. | ibid. |
| An Assembly of the States at the Louvre. | ibid. |
| Accusations brought against the Pope, appeals to a Council. | ibid. |
| The Pope taken by Nogaret at Anagnina. | 493 |
| The Deliverance of the Pope, and his Death. | ibid. |
| The | |

The CONTENTS.

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| The Letters of Boniface VIII. <i>ibid.</i> | A Dispute between the Emperor and Pope concerning the Property of the things consumed by the Grey-Friars <i>ibid.</i> | Proposals of Peace between Gregory and Benedict. <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Election of Benedict XI. <i>ibid.</i> | The Question of the Happiness of the Saints immediately after their Death moved, and debated by Pope John XXII. 505 | The King of France sends Ambassadors to procure the Peace of the Church, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Accusation of Boniface, before Benedict XI. <i>ibid.</i> | The Letters of John XXII. <i>ibid.</i> | Gregory and Benedict evade the Cession 515 |
| The Revocation of the Bulls of Boniface VIII. against France and the Colonnii, <i>ibid.</i> | The Election of Benedict XII. <i>ibid.</i> | The Revolt of the Cardinals from Gregory <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Excommunication of Nogaret, and those who assisted him in taking Boniface. <i>ibid.</i> | A Determination of the Question of the Happiness of the Saints by Benedict XII. <i>ibid.</i> | The Act of the Appeal of the Cardinals, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Death and Letters of Benedict XI. <i>ibid.</i> | Benedict XII. confirms the Judgment of his Predecessors against Lewis of Bavaria, and the Grey-Friars, 506 | The Proceedings of Gregory, against the Cardinals that revolted, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Petition of Nogaret and the French, against the Memory of Boniface. <i>ibid.</i> | Rules made by Benedict XII. and his Death <i>ibid.</i> | Abusive Bulls sent by Benedict to the King of France, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Election of Clement V. <i>ibid.</i> | The Works of Benedict XII. <i>ibid.</i> | The Proceedings against Benedict and his Bulls, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Revocations of Boniface's Bulls by Clement V. 494 | The Election of Clement VI. <i>ibid.</i> | The Publication of the Neutrality in France, 516 |
| A Rule of Process against the Memory of Boniface VIII. <i>ibid.</i> | Rules made by Clement about the Affairs of Italy, <i>ibid.</i> | Gregory and Benedict appoint Councils, and the Cardinals order one at Pisa, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Judgment of the General Council of Vienna, concerning the Affair of Boniface. <i>ibid.</i> | Lewis of Bavaria Excommunicated anew by Clement <i>ibid.</i> | A Synod of French Bishops, who made Rules for the time of the Neutrality <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. II. The History of the Condemnation of the Templars, 495 | The Election of Charles IV. to the Empire, <i>ibid.</i> | The Punishment of certain Couriers, who brought Pope Benedict's Bulls into France, 517 |
| The Original, Progress and Decay of the Templars. <i>ibid.</i> | The Enterprize of Nich. Laurentius in Rome, 507 | Chap. V. The Lives and Writings of the Authors who flourished in the Fourteenth Century, 517 |
| The Accusers of the Templars. <i>ibid.</i> | The Death of Clement VI. <i>ibid.</i> | Three Ages of the Schoolmen, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Templars arrested, and their Goods seized. <i>ibid.</i> | The Election and Actions of Innocent VI. <i>ibid.</i> | The Study of the Civil and Canon Law in the Fourteenth Century, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Informations against the Templars. <i>ib.</i> | The Election of Urban V. and his Actions, <i>ibid.</i> | Dinus de Mugello, Professor of the University of Bononia, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Crimes of which they were accused. <i>ibid.</i> | The Election and Actions of Gregory XI. <i>ibid.</i> | Engelbert Abbot Admont, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Pope forbids the Bishops and Inquisitors meddling with the Cause of the Templars, 496 | Chap. IV. The History of the Schism of the Popes of Rome and Avignon, and what happened in Christendom on that Account, until the holding of the Council of Pisa. 508 | Jacobus Cajetanus a Cardinal. 518 |
| The Answer of the Doctors of Divinity in Paris, about the business of the Templars, <i>ibid.</i> | The Election of Urban VI. made by force, <i>ibid.</i> | Stephanus de Salagnac a Dominican <i>ib.</i> |
| The Pope himself questions the Templars. <i>ibid.</i> | The Beginning of the Papacy of Urban VI. 509 | Andreas Novo-castrensis a Dominican <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Promises of the Pope to proceed against the Templars, <i>ibid.</i> | The Cardinals retire to make another Election, <i>ibid.</i> | Rainerius de Pifa a Dominican <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Informations taken by three Cardinals at Chinon. 497 | The Election of Clement VII. <i>ibid.</i> | William de Nangis a Monk of St Denis <i>ibid.</i> |
| Bulls against the Templars. <i>ibid.</i> | The Division of the Christian Princes about the two Popes elected. <i>ibid.</i> | Thomas Wicke a Canon-Regular, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Judges commission'd by the Pope to proceed against the Order of the Templars. <i>ibid.</i> | Clement VII. goes to Avignon, 510 | Henry Stero a Monk of Alvaich <i>ibid.</i> |
| Informations taken by the Pope's Commissioners, <i>ibid.</i> | Wars in Italy between Lewis Duke of Anjou and Charles de Duras, <i>ibid.</i> | Eberardus Archdeacon of Ratisbone, <i>ib.</i> |
| A provincial Council held at Paris against the Templars, 498 | Urban VI. arrested by Charles de Duras, and constrained to fly to Genoa, <i>ibid.</i> | Joannes de Joinville Governor of Champagne, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Execution of the Templars at Paris, <i>ibid.</i> | Clement VII. being acknowledged by the Kings of Castile and Arragon, would raise a Tax in France. <i>ibid.</i> | Suffridus a Priest of Misnia. <i>ibid.</i> |
| Prosecutions against the Templars in several Kingdoms, <i>ibid.</i> | The Death of Charles de Duras and Urban VI. <i>ibid.</i> | Haito a Canon-Regular of the Premonstratenses. <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Judgment of the Pope in the Council of Vienna against the Templars, <i>ib.</i> | The Election of Boniface IX. by the Roman Cardinals, 511 | Joannes Le Moine a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Execution of the Grand Master, and a Templar at Paris, 499 | Lewis Duke of Anjou crowned King of Sicily by Clement VII. <i>ibid.</i> | William of Paris a Dominican <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Use which the Templars Estates were put to in divers Nations, <i>ibid.</i> | The Contrivance of the University of Paris to remove the Schism, <i>ibid.</i> | Joannes Parisiensis a Dominican, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Objections alledged in Justification of the Templars, <i>ibid.</i> | The Death of Clement VII. <i>ibid.</i> | Joannes Parisiensis a Canon-Regular, 519 |
| Reasons to prove the Justice of the abolishing the Order of the Templars, 500 | The Election of Benedict XII. at Avignon against the King of France's Will, <i>ibid.</i> | Thomas Joyce a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> |
| Chap. III. The History of the Popes who had their Residence at Avignon, from Clement V. to the Death of Gregory XI. and what Remarkable things happened in the Empire, Italy and the Church in their Papacies, and among other things, the Contest of Lewis of Bavaria with the Popes. The Contest of the Grey-Friars with John XXII. and the Question about the Happy estate of Souls after this Life, moved by that Pope. 501 | An Assembly of the Prelates of France which advised the Way of Cession 512 | Joannes de Geminiano a Dominican. <i>ib.</i> |
| The Election of Pope John XXII. <i>ib.</i> | Benedict revokes the Way of Cession, <i>ib.</i> | Jacobus de Benedictis a Franciscan <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Elections of Archbishopricks and Bishopricks by John XXII. <i>ibid.</i> | An Act of Appeal of the University of Paris, <i>ibid.</i> | Justus an Abbot of the Cistercians, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The State of the Empire and Italy, <i>ibid.</i> | A withdrawing of Obedience from the two Contendants for the Papacy, resolved and published in France, <i>ib.</i> | Joannes Duns Scotus a Grey-Friar, <i>ib.</i> |
| Nicholas V. Antipope. 502 | The withdrawing agreed on upon certain Conditions, 513 | Raimundus Lullus of the same Order, 520 |
| The Death of John XXII. 503 | Proposals of Union made to Boniface, <i>ibid.</i> | Joannes de Fribourg Bishop of Osma <i>ib.</i> |
| The Contest of the Grey-Friars about the Fashion of their Habits, <i>ibid.</i> | The Death of Boniface, 514 | Egidius Romanus Archbishop of Bourges, <i>ibid.</i> |
| The Disputes of the Grey-Friars, concerning the Property of such things as they consumed <i>ibid.</i> | The Election of Innocent VII. at Rome and his Actions, <i>ibid.</i> | William Durant Bishop of Menda 521 |
| The Condemnation of the Errors of Petrus Joannes Oliva de Serignan 504 | Projects for Union among the Contendants <i>ibid.</i> | Victor Porchet de Salvaticis a Carthusian. <i>ibid.</i> |
| | The University of Paris renewed the Substraction, <i>ibid.</i> | Malachias a Grey-Friar, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | The Death of Innocent VII. and the Election of Gregory XII. <i>ibid.</i> | William le Maire Bishop of Angers <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | William de Mandagot a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Berengarius de Fredol a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | James de Thermes Abbot of Charliu <i>ib.</i> |
| | | Antonius Andreas a Grey-Friar, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Harvæus Natalis a Dominican, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Ptolomæus Lucensis Bishop of Torcello, <i>ib.</i> |
| | | Philip Bishop of Aichstat <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Hugo Pratenfis a Dominican. 522 |
| | | Joannes de Neapoli a Dominican, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Petrus Aureolus Archbishop of Aix, <i>ib.</i> |
| | | Nicholas Trivet a Dominican, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Augustinus Triumphus an Augustine. <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Albert of Padua an Augustine Hermit <i>ib.</i> |
| | | Joannes Bassolis a Grey-Friar <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Jacobus de Lausana a Dominican, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Henry de Carrez Bishop of Lucca, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Dominicus Grenerius Bishop of Pamiez <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Petrus Alvernienfis, a Canon of Paris <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Vitalis è Furno a Cardinal, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | Marinus Sanutus or Sannudo surnamed Torfellus, <i>ibid.</i> |
| | | O * * Alex |

The C O N T E N T S.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <i>Alexander de S Elpidio</i> , Archbishop of Ravenna, 523. | <i>S. Catharine</i> of Sienna, 532 | <i>Nilus Cabassilas</i> Archbishop of Thessalonica, ibid. |
| <i>Alvarez Pelagius</i> Bishop of Silves, ibid. | <i>Mathew Florilegus</i> a Benedictine, ibid | <i>Nicholas Cabassilas</i> Archbishop of the same place, ibid |
| <i>William Ockam</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid. | <i>Albert</i> of Strasburg, ibid | <i>Nicephorus Gregoras</i> , <i>Chartophylax</i> of the Church of Constantinople, ibid |
| <i>Marsilius</i> of Padua a Lawyer, 524 | <i>John Scadland</i> Bishop of Worms, ibid | <i>Callistus</i> Patriarch of Constantinople, 542 |
| <i>Radulphus de Præles</i> , 525 | <i>Nicholas Oresme</i> Doctor of Paris, ibid | <i>Philothens</i> Patriarch of Constantinople ib. |
| <i>Philippus Mazerius</i> , ibid | <i>Robert Gervais</i> Bishop of Senes, ibid | <i>Theophanes</i> Archbishop of Nice, ibid |
| <i>Ubertinus de Cassalis</i> a Grey-Friar, ib. | <i>Jordanus Saxo</i> an Augustine, ibid | <i>Nilus</i> Archbishop of Rhodes, ibid |
| <i>Michael Casenas</i> General of the Grey-Friars, ibid | <i>Philip Cabassilas</i> Cardinal, ibid | <i>John Cantacuzenus</i> Emperor of the Greeks, ibid |
| <i>Joannes de Janduno</i> or of Gaunt, ibid | <i>Gerhardus Groot</i> a Canon-Regular, ib. | <i>Joannes Cyparissiota</i> , ibid |
| <i>Bernardus Guido</i> , Bishop of Tuy, ibid | <i>Peter de Natalibus</i> Bishop of Jesol, ib. | <i>Manuel Calecas</i> a Dominican, ibid |
| <i>Guy de Perpignan</i> Bishop of Elne, ibid | <i>John de Rusbroek</i> a Canon-Regular, 533 | <i>Isaac Argyrus</i> a Greek Monk, ibid |
| <i>Arnoldus de Terrenâ</i> Sacrist of Perpignan, ibid. | <i>Philip de Leyde</i> a Canon of Utrecht, ib. | <i>Manuel Palæologus</i> the Greek Emperor, ibid |
| <i>Franciscus Maronius</i> a Grey-Friar, 526 | <i>Bonaventure</i> of Padua a Cardinal, ibid | <i>Nilus Damila</i> a Greek Monk, ibid |
| <i>Bertrandus de Turre</i> a Cardinal, ibid | <i>John de Burgo</i> Chancellor of Cambridge, ibid | <i>Maximus</i> a Greek Monk, ibid |
| <i>Durandus de S. Porciano</i> Bishop of Meaux ibid | <i>Philip Kibot</i> a Carmelite, ibid | <i>Demetrius Cydonicus</i> , ibid |
| <i>Odericus de Port-naon</i> a Grey-Friar, ib. | <i>Jacobus de Teramo</i> Archdeacon of Aversa, ibid | |
| <i>Guido Abbot</i> of St. Denys. ibid | <i>Guido d'Eureux</i> a Dominican, ibid. | |
| <i>William</i> of Nottingham Canon of York. | <i>Augustin d'Ascoli</i> an Augustine Hermit, ibid | |
| <i>William Mount</i> Canon of Lincoln, ib. | <i>Henry Boich</i> a Doctor of Law, ibid | |
| <i>Philip de Montcalier</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | <i>Simon de Cremona</i> an Augustine Hermit, ibid | |
| <i>Astefanus</i> of the same Order, ibid | <i>Peter Quesnel</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | |
| <i>Nicolas de Lyrâ</i> , ibid | <i>Marcilius ab Inghen</i> a Doctor of Paris, ibid | |
| <i>Peter Bertraudus</i> a Cardinal, ibid | <i>Henry Knighton</i> a Canon-Regular, ib. | |
| <i>William de Rubion</i> a Grey-Friar, 528 | <i>William Thorn</i> a Benedictine, ibid | |
| <i>Guido de Montrocher</i> a French Divine, ib. | <i>Gerhardus de Zutphen</i> a Canon-Regular, ibid | |
| <i>Alonaldus</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | <i>Nicholas Eymericus</i> a Dominican, and Inquisitor, ibid | |
| <i>Ludolphus</i> the Saxon a <i>Carthusian</i> , ibid | <i>Mathew d'Eureux</i> a Dominican, 534 | |
| <i>William de Montledun</i> Abbot <i>Monstier-neuf</i> , ibid | <i>Nicholas de Gorham</i> a Dominican, ib. | |
| <i>Simon Borastou</i> an Englishman, ibid | <i>John Bromiard</i> of the same Order, ib. | |
| <i>Bartholomew de S. Concordiâ</i> a Friar-Preacher, ibid | <i>William of Woodford</i> a Grey-Friar ibid | |
| <i>Bartholomew</i> Bishop of Urbin, ibid | <i>Rodolphus de Rivo</i> Dean of Tongres, ib. | |
| <i>Bartholomew Albius</i> a Grey-Friar ibid | <i>Joannes Tombacus</i> Master of the Sacred Palace, ibid | |
| <i>William Baldensel</i> a German Knight, ib. | <i>Raimundus Jordanus</i> Abbot of Cella, ibid | |
| <i>Arnoldus Cescomes</i> Archbishop <i>Tarragon</i> , ibid | <i>Francis Ximenius</i> Bishop of Elnæ, ibid | |
| <i>Daniel Trevisi</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | <i>Antonius de Butrio</i> a Lawyer, ibid | |
| <i>Henry de Urimaria</i> an Augustinian ibid | <i>Lucius Collucius</i> a Lawyer, ibid | |
| <i>Robert Cowton</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | <i>Henry de Palmâ</i> , or <i>de Baume</i> , a Grey-Friar, 535 | |
| <i>Durandus de Champagne</i> of the same Order, ibid. | <i>Bertrand de Trille</i> a Dominican, ibid | |
| <i>Clement</i> of Florence of the Order of the Servites, ibid | <i>Joannes Grossus</i> a Carmelite, ibid | |
| <i>Lupoldus</i> de Bamberg a Lawyer, ibid | <i>Michael-Angrianus</i> a Carmelite, ibid | |
| <i>Walter Barley</i> a Grey-Friar, 529 | <i>Francis Zabarell</i> a Cardinal, ibid | |
| <i>John Canon</i> of the same Order, ibid | <i>Jacobus Magnus</i> an Augustine, ibid | |
| <i>Petrus de Palude</i> Patriarch of Jerusalem, ibid | <i>Baldus</i> a Lawyer, ibid | |
| <i>Francis Petrarch</i> a Lawyer, ibid | <i>Petrus Harentalius</i> Abbot of Floreff, ibid | |
| <i>John Bacon</i> a Carmelite, ibid | | |
| <i>Joannes Becanus</i> a Canon of Utrecht, ib. | | |
| <i>Simon Fidatus de Cassâ</i> an Augustine Hermit, ibid | | |
| <i>Joannes Andrea</i> a Lawyer, ibid | | |
| <i>Robert Holkot</i> a Dominican, ibid | | |
| <i>Richard Hampole</i> an Augustine, ibid | | |
| <i>Joannes Honsenius</i> , a Canon of Lige, 530 | | |
| <i>Gerard Odonis</i> , ibid. | | |
| <i>James Folquier</i> an Augustine. ibid | | |
| <i>Bernardus</i> Abbot of <i>Mont Cassin</i> , ibid. | | |
| <i>Thomas Bradwardin</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid. | | |
| <i>Albericus de Rosate</i> a Lawyer, ibid | | |
| <i>Petrus de Paternis</i> an Augustine, ibid | | |
| <i>Peter</i> a Monk of <i>Clarâ Valle</i> , ibid | | |
| <i>Richard Fitz-Ralph</i> Archbishop of <i>Armagh</i> , ibid | | |
| <i>Roger Conway</i> a Grey-Friar 531 | | |
| <i>Gregorius Ariminensis</i> , General of the Hermits of St. Austine, ibid | | |
| <i>Thomas Strasburg</i> General of the same Order, ibid | | |
| <i>Adam Goddam</i> a Grey-Friar, ibid | | |
| <i>Ralph Higden</i> a Benedictine, ibid | | |
| <i>Joannes Thaulerus</i> a Dominican, ibid | | |
| <i>Petrus Bercherius</i> Prior of S. <i>Eligius</i> , ib. | | |
| <i>Bernardus Dapifer</i> a Monk of <i>Melch</i> , ib. | | |
| <i>Joannes Calderinus</i> a Lawyer ibid | | |
| <i>Bartholomew Glanville</i> a Grey-Friar, ib. | | |
| <i>Alphonsus Vargas</i> Archbishop of <i>Sevil</i> , ib. | | |
| <i>Mathew de Cracovia</i> Professor of <i>Prague</i> ibid | | |
| <i>Gallus</i> Abbot of <i>Konigsaal</i> , ibid | | |
| <i>Henry</i> a Monk of <i>Rebdorfe</i> , ibid | | |
| <i>Hugolinus Malebranchius</i> Bishop of <i>Ariminum</i> , ibid | | |
| <i>Thomas Stubs</i> a Dominican, ibid | | |
| <i>S. Bridget</i> , ibid | | |
| | <i>CHAP. VI. An History of the Greek Church, and the Authors, who flourished in the East in the fourteenth Age of the Church, 537</i> | |
| | <i>The History of the Greek Emperors</i> , ib. | |
| | <i>The Inclination of the Greeks towards the Latins</i> , 538 | |
| | <i>Some Proposals of Union under Andronicus</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>Some Projects of Union under Cantacuzenus</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>The union of Joannes Palæologus</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>The Contest between the Barlaamites and Palamites</i> , 539 | |
| | <i>The first Council of Constantinople against the Barlaamites in 1340.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The second Council of Constantinople against Acindynus</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>The third Council of Constantinople against the Palamites</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The fourth Council of Constantinople against the Palamites</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>The fifth Council of Constantinople against the Barlaamites</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>Barlaam</i> made Bishop of <i>Hieracium</i> , 540 | |
| | <i>Gregory Acindynus</i> a Greek Monk, ibid | |
| | <i>Gregory Palamas</i> Archbishop of <i>Thessalonica</i> , ibid | |
| | <i>Nicephorus Callistus</i> a Greek Monk, 541 | |
| | <i>Andronicus</i> the Elder, the Greek Emperor, ibid | |
| | <i>Maximus Planudes</i> a Greek Monk, ibid | |
| | <i>Matthæw Blastares</i> , a Greek Monk, ib. | |
| | <i>CHAP VII. The Councils held in the fourteenth Century, 543</i> | |
| | <i>The Council of Melun in 1300.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Synodal Constitutions of Wicboldus</i> Archbishop of <i>Colen</i> in 1300. ib. | |
| | <i>The Synodal Constitutions of Bayeux</i> made about 1300. ibid | |
| | <i>The Council of Ausche in 1300.</i> ib. | |
| | <i>Of Compeigne in 1301.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Nogarol in 1303.</i> 545 | |
| | <i>Of Compeigne in 1304.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Ausche in 1308.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Presburg in Hungary in 1309.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Saltzburg in 1310.</i> 545 | |
| | <i>Of Colen in 1310.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The General Council of Vienna in Dauphine in 1311.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Council of Ravenna in 1311.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Ravenna in 1314.</i> ib. | |
| | <i>Of Ravenna in 1317.</i> 547 | |
| | <i>Of Paris in 1314.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Summur in 1315.</i> 548 | |
| | <i>Of Nogarol in 1315.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Councils of Sens in 1316.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>1317.</i> and | |
| | <i>Of Sens in 1320 and of Paris in 1323.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Valadolid in the Diocess of Paleniza in Castile in 1322. and in Toledo in 1323.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Council of Toledo in 1324.</i> 549 | |
| | <i>Of Colen in 1322.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Avignon in 1326.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Avignon in 1337.</i> 550 | |
| | <i>The Councils of Marsas in 1326. and 1730.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Sens in 1326. and Compeigne in 1329.</i> 551 | |
| | <i>Of Complutum in 1326. and Penafiel in 1302.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Council of Ruffec in 1327.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Salamanca in 1335.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Roan in 1335.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Bourges in 1336.</i> 552 | |
| | <i>Of Chateau-gonthier in 1336.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Toledo in 1339.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Noyon in 1344.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Paris in 1346.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Toledo in 1347.</i> 553 | |
| | <i>Of Beziers in 1351.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Toledo in 1355.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Angers in 1365.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Lavour in 1368.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Narbonne in 1374.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Saltzburg in 1386.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Paleniza in 1388.</i> 554 | |
| | <i>Councils held in England in the fourteenth Century.</i> | |
| | <i>The Council of London in 1321.</i> | |
| | <i>Of London in 1328.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Lambeth in 1330.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Macclesfield in 1332.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>The Councils of London in 1341, 1342, and 1343.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of Lambeth in 1351. Macclesfield and Lambeth in 1362.</i> ibid | |
| | <i>Of York in 1367.</i> 555 | |
| | <i>CHAP VIII. Heresies and Errors published and condemned in the fourteenth Century. 555</i> | |
| | <i>The Sect of the Frerots or Shavelings,</i> The | |

The C O N T E N T S.

| | | | | | |
|--|------|--|------|---|------|
| The Errors of <i>Petrus Joannes Olivæ</i> , | ibid | The Visions of <i>Janovez</i> , | ibid | Rules for Curates and Mendicant Friars about their Preaching and Administration of Sacraments, | ibid |
| The Practices of the Spiritual Friars, | ibid | The Opinions of <i>John de Latona</i> and <i>Bonagette</i> , about the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, | ibid | New Congregations settled in the fourteenth Age, | ibid |
| The Begards and Beguines, | ibid | The Errors of <i>Arnoldus Montanier</i> , | ibid | | |
| <i>Gerhardus Segarelli</i> , | ibid | <i>Turlupins</i> , | ibid | <i>The Titles of the Tables of this Volume.</i> | |
| <i>Dulcinus de Novaria</i> , | ibid | Errors condemned by <i>Simon Langham</i> , | ibid | A Chronological Table of the Ecclesiastical History of the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th and 14th Ages of the Church. | |
| <i>Herman de Pongeloup</i> , | ibid | | | A Chronological Table of the Ecclesiastical Authors, and their Works: | |
| <i>Arnoldus de Villâ Novâ</i> , | ibid | CHAP IX. Ecclesiastical Observations upon the fourteenth Age, | 557 | A Chronological Table of the Councils, their Acts, Letters, Canons and Articles. | |
| The Lollards a German Sect, | ibid | The Question of the Ecclesiastical Power above the Temporal, | ibid | A Table of the Works of the Ecclesiastical Authors disposed according to the Order of the Matters they treat on. | |
| <i>Cecus Asculanus</i> , | 556 | The Effects of the Popes Residence at <i>Avignon</i> , | ibid | An Alphabetical Table of the Ecclesiastical Authors. | |
| The Errors of <i>Eckard</i> , | ibid | The Settlement of the first fruits of Benefices, | ibid | An Alphabetical Table of the Councils | |
| <i>Marsilius of Padua</i> , | ibid | The Settlement of the Jubilee, | ibid | A General Index of the Principal Matters contained in this Volume. | |
| Propositions of <i>John Mercourt</i> Condemned by the Faculty of Divines at <i>Paris</i> , | ibid | The Question of the Poverty of Christ and his Apostles, | ibid | | |
| The Recantation of <i>Nicholas Utrivcourt</i> , | ibid | The Question of the State of Souls after Death, | ibid | | |
| Of Doctor <i>Simon</i> , | | The Discipline of the Church about Benefices and beneficed Persons, | ibid | | |
| Of Friar <i>Guy</i> , | ibid | Several Rules about the Manners, and Practices of Clergymen, | 558 | | |
| Of <i>Lewis</i> a Divine, | ibid | Observations about the Monastick State, | ibid | | |
| Of <i>John de Chaleur</i> . | ibid | | | | |
| The Condemnation of the Errors of <i>Dionysius Soulechar</i> , | ibid | | | | |
| The Errors of <i>Berthoul Rorbarch</i> , | ibid | | | | |
| The foolish Opinions of <i>Martin Gonsalvus</i> , | 557 | | | | |
| Other Follies of <i>Nicholas of Calabria</i> , | ibid | | | | |





BIBLIOTHECA PATRUM:

OR, A NEW

HISTORY

O F

Ecclesiastical Writers :

V O L. II.

C O N T A I N I N G

An Account of the LIVES and WRITINGS of the *Primitive FATHERS*, that Flourished in the *Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth, Centuries of Christianity*, with *Censures* upon all their *BOOKS*, determining which are *Genuine*, and which *Spurious*.

St. ISIDORE of Sevil.

St. Isidore.



St. Isidore the Son of Severianus, and Grand-Child of Theodorick, King of Italy, was born at Sevil. He succeeded his Brother St. Leander, in the Bishoprick of that City, about the Year 595. He held a Council in 623, and died in 636, having governed the Church of Sevil forty Years. This Bishop was a Man of great Reading and profound Learning, and has written upon

divers Subjects. His Works may be divided into five Classes. The first comprehending those which concern Arts or Sciences. The second his Commentaries upon the Scripture. The third his dogmatical Tracts. The fourth his Treatises of Church Discipline. And the last his Works of Morality or Piety.

The Book of Etymologies, or of Origins, is the largest of those of the First Class: He wrote it at the Request of Braulio Bishop of * Saragosa who divided it into twenty Books, and made up what Isidore had not finish'd. This Work is an Epitome of all Arts and Sciences; he explains the Terms, lays down the Principles, and shews what is most in use in Vol. II.

each of them. What relates to Ecclesiastical Matters is as follows. In the Sixth Book he maketh a Catalogue of the Books of the Old and New Testament: In which he places, in the fourth Class of the (a) Canonical Books [(a) Canonical Books---Tobit, Ecclesiasticus.] As the Jews never acknowledged these Books to be Canonical, so neither did the Primitive Church of Christ. St. Cyprian, (or rather Rufinus) in his Tract *De Expos. Symb.* having reckon'd up the Books in Order, which made up the Canon in his time, and omitting those which were accounted Apocryphal, says, *Hæc sunt, &c.* These are the Books which are received into the Canon by the Church; the other Books (meaning Tobit, &c.) are not Canonical. The same Catalogue of Canonical Writers do Origen in *Eusebius Hist. Eccl.* l. 6. c. 25, and the Council of *Laodicea*, c. 59. give us: So that there can be no doubt, but for the first four hundred Years, and more, the Canon was exactly the same that we now have. Indeed the Apocryphal Books were read in the Churches of the purer Ages to the Novices and Catechumens (as were also *Clement* and *Ignarius's* Epistles, and *Hermes's* Book called *Pastor*, yea, and some of the later Fathers, as *St. Jerome*, *Aufine*, and *Innocent*, give them very honorable Titles, calling them *Sacred*, *Divine*, *Canonical*; but then they mean not by Canonical as the Church of *Rome* doth, *Canones Fidei* l. 18. c. 36. a perfect rule both for Faith and Manners, but *Canones Morum* or *Historia*, profitable to instruction, and to inform Men in the History of the Jewish Church: And so far is this Doctrine of *S. Isidore* Orthodox in the Judgment of the Church of *England* our Mother. *Art. 6.* of

St. Isidore.

Cypr. de
exp. symb.

Con. Laod.

Anno 320.

Euseb. Hist.

Eccel. l. 3.

Aug. de

div. Dei

Canones Fidei

l. 18. c. 36.

Hieron.

Conc. Flor.

Art. 6. of

of the Old Testament, *Ecclesiasticus*, the *Book of Wisdom*, *Judith*, *Tobit*, and the two Books of the *Maccabees*. He distinguisheth three Senses of the Scripture, the Historical, Moral and Allegorical. He speaks of the Authors of the Canonical Books, and of those that have composed Harmonies of the Gospels. He reckons up but four General Councils. He makes a Paschal Cycle. In fine he treats of the principal Festivals of the Jews and Christians, and of the Administration of the Sacrament. He saith, it is called a Sacrifice, because it is made sacred by a mystical Prayer, in remembrance of the Passion of our Lord. He defineth (b) a Sacrament, the Sign of an Holy Thing communicating Holiness. He places in that rank Baptism, Chrism, and the Eucharist, which are, saith he, Sacraments, because under the Veil of Corporeal Things, the divine Vertue does secretly operate Salvation. To the Union he joyns the laying on of Hands, which brings down the Holy Ghost. He speaks of Exorcism. He makes the Apostles Authors of the Creed: which he thinks to have been called a Symbol, because it is the Badge whereby Christians know one another. He speaks of Prayer, of Fasting, and of

Penance, which, he says, is a voluntary Punishment for ones Sins. He defines *Satisfaction*, the Exclusion of the Causes and Occasions of Sin, and the Cessation of Sinning. He calls Reconciliation the end of Penance. He distinguisheth two sorts of *Exomologesis* or Confession, the one of Praise, the other of Sins; and saith, both the one and the other are chiefly made to God. Lastly, he makes mention of the Rogations or Litanies.

In the seventh Book he treats of the Names and Attributes of God: Chap. 1. Of the Son of God, of his Qualities, of his metaphorical and natural Names. Chap. 2. Of the Holy Ghost. Chap. 3. of the Trinity, and of the appellative and relative Names of the Persons. Chap. 4. Of Angels and their different Orders. Chap. 5. He explains also the Names of the Persons mention'd in the Bible; he gives the definition of the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the Apostles, the Martyrs, the Clerks and Monks.

In the eighth Book he speaks of the Church, of Heresy, of the Number of the Sybils, &c.

The three Books of the differences of Names, or of the proper Signification of Words, written by the same Author, are a Grammatical Work; and the Book of the Nature of Things to [King] *Sisebut*, a Physical Treatise, of which we have nothing here to say.

To this Classis of St. *Isidore's* Works may be added his Historical Tracts; which are a Chronological Abridgment, from the beginning of the World down to **Heraclius's* 17th. Year Empire. An History of the *Goths*, from the 176th. Year of the Em-Christ, to the Year 610. with an Epitome of the History of the *Vandals* and *Sueves*. The Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, which we have defended in the Preface of the preceding Volume, and the Treatise of the Life and Death of Year 626.] certain Saints.

[[b) A Sacrament—communicating Holiness.] The Sacraments may in a pious and good Sense be said to communicate Sanctifying Grace and Holiness, not *ex opere operato*, as the Church of Rome teacheth, but *ex opere operantis*, being moral Instruments of conferring and conveying the Grace of God to the Souls of all worthy Partakers of them, God being pleased by and with them, to work Spiritual Graces and Endowments in us: *Non propter virtutem Sacramentorum quæ sumimus, sed propter vim fidei in Christo, quæ illis communicamus. Not through any virtue in the Sacraments which we receive; but through Faith in the Receiver.*]

Penance, which, he says, is a voluntary Punishment for ones Sins. He defines *Satisfaction*, the Exclusion of the Causes and Occasions of Sin, and the Cessation of Sinning. He calls Reconciliation the end of Penance. He distinguisheth two sorts of *Exomologesis* or Confession, the one of Praise, the other of Sins; and saith, both the one and the other are chiefly made to God. Lastly, he makes mention of the Rogations or Litanies.

In the seventh Book he treats of the Names and Attributes of God: Chap. 1. Of the Son of God, of his Qualities, of his metaphorical and natural Names. Chap. 2. Of the Holy Ghost. Chap. 3. of the Trinity, and of the appellative and relative Names of the Persons. Chap. 4. Of Angels and their different Orders. Chap. 5. He explains also the Names of the Persons mention'd in the Bible; he gives the definition of the Patriarchs, the Prophets, the Apostles, the Martyrs, the Clerks and Monks.

In the eighth Book he speaks of the Church, of Heresy, of the Number of the Sybils, &c.

The three Books of the differences of Names, or of the proper Signification of Words, written by the same Author, are a Grammatical Work; and the Book of the Nature of Things to [King] *Sisebut*, a Physical Treatise, of which we have nothing here to say.

To this Classis of St. *Isidore's* Works may be added his Historical Tracts; which are a Chronological Abridgment, from the beginning of the World down to **Heraclius's* 17th. Year Empire. An History of the *Goths*, from the 176th. Year of the Em-Christ, to the Year 610. with an Epitome of the History of the *Vandals* and *Sueves*. The Treatise of Ecclesiastical Writers, which we have defended in the Preface of the preceding Volume, and the Treatise of the Life and Death of Year 626.] certain Saints.

The Treatises that St. *Isidore* writ upon the Bible, which may make up the Second Classis of his Works, are these: Some *Prolegomena's*, wherein he treats of the Authors of the Books of the Old and New Testament, some Annotations upon the *Pentateuch*, upon *Joshua*, upon the Books of *Kings*, and upon *Ezra*, wherein he maketh some Remarks Literal or Moral, which are often grounded upon Names, which he explains according to his Fancy, or upon Observations of little solidity; a Book of Allegories on the *Oktateuch*, which is a compendious Collection of Allegorical Expositions made by the Fathers before him; and a Commentary upon the *Song of Solomon*, which he expounds of the Church and Jesus Christ, with great perspicuity and brevity.

Of the Dogmatical Tracts of St. *Isidore*, we have none remaining but two Books against the Jews, written to his Sister **Florentina*; in which he hath gathered some Passages of the Holy Scripture to prove our Religion. The First of these two Books is upon the Passion, the Resurrection, the Reign of Christ, and upon the Judgment. The Second is upon the Calling of the Gentiles, and the Establishing of the Church: The Proofs he brings are solid, and his Reflections judicious.

Among his Books of Discipline, that of the [Ecclesiastical or Divine] Offices is the most considerable. It is divided into two Books: In the First he treats of the Parts and Ceremonies of Divine Service; he confesses, in the Primitive Church, Prayers were read with a plain turn of the Voice more like pronouncing than singing: He distinguisheth two sorts of Hymns, those of the Scripture, of which the Holy Ghost is the Author, and those of Mens Com-

position. He saith, St. *Hilarius* was the first that made any of them, and that after him St. *Ambrose* did also compose some which have been recited in the Church of Milan, and from thence passed down to the other Western Churches. And further says, that St. *Ambrose* first established the Use of Anthems, and that Responses were invented in Italy. He distinguisheth Seven Parts in

the (c) *Mass*, or the Canon, which he believes was (d) established by St. *Peter*. 1. The Admonition to the People, to stir them up to pray. 2. The Prayer to God, that he would receive the Prayers and Oblations of his People. 3. A Prayer for the Living who offered the Sacrifice, and (e) for the Dead. 4. The Prayer for Peace. 5. The Prayers for sanctifying of the Bread and Wine. 6. The Confirmation of the Sacrament. 7. The Lord's Prayer. The *Nicene* Creed was also recited, and at last they blessed the People. Then he observeth that the Communion must be taken Fasting, and that

[(c) *Mass* or Canon.] The Word *Missa* or *Mass*, is an old Latin Word, and signifies generally the whole Service of the Church, but more especially the Holy Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. It was called *Missa*, or *Demissio*, because no Man was suffered to remain in the Church, that could not or would not receive the Sacrament; and therefore such Persons as had a mind to see and hear, but not receive, were all, without exception, dismissed by the Deacon, after the Sermon was ended with these Words. *Ite, missa est: Go, ye are dismissed.* And if any delay'd they were urg'd to depart by the Deacons and Exorcists, saying aloud, *si quis non communice, det locum; Whosoever will not receive let him go out.* The Roman Church puts a different Sense upon this Word *Mass*, understanding by it, that Solemn Service, wherein they do pretend to offer unto God the Body and Blood of his Son, as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Sins of both the Quick and Dead. *Isidore* takes it here in the first Sense, calling it, *Ordo Precum*. i. e. The Form of Prayers: But M. *Du Pin*, by joyning it with the Word Canon, (a Word of much later use, and which signifies in the Roman Church, the Rule or Form of celebrating their Mass) seems to bring it over to the latter, but against the Sense of St. *Isidore* of *Sevil*.]

[(d) Established by St. Peter.] But erroneously; for in the Apostle's time the Holy Sacrament was celebrated without any Ceremonies or Prayers, save that at the Consecration of the Elements, the Priest repeated the Lord's Prayer over them. And this St. *Jerome* says was done by the Institution of Christ himself. *Dominus docuit Apostolos ut Orationem Dominicam dicerent super Sacrificio Corporis.* And Innocent III. himself tells us, that St. *Peter* celebrated the Sacrament at *Antioch*, with three Prayers only: *Primus B. Petrus. Apostolus Missam Antiochia dicitur celebrasse in qua tres tantum Orationes, in primordio nascentis Ecclesie dicebantur.* So that it is absurd to think St. *Peter* the Author of so long an Office.]

[(e) Prayers in the Sacrament—for the Dead.] It is evident from some very Ancient Records of the Church, That it was a Custom among the Christians, *Ab Antiquo*, to pray for the Souls of the Faithful departed, in the dreadful Mysteries. Whether it were decreed by the Apostles themselves, as St. *Chrysostome* plainly tells it was, in his Comment on the *Philippians*, may be a very great doubt; but it is certain it was in use about 200 years after Christ. This is proved from *Tertullian*, *De Monog.* c. 10. who thus speaks, Let the faithful Widow pray for the Soul of her Husband, &c. And to the same effect in *Coron. Mil.* c. 3. So also St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 66. *Euseb. de Vit a Constant.* l. 4. c. 7. and *Epiphanius Har.* 3. &c. And this we find practised by many of the most eminent Fathers of the Church. *Nazianzen* prayed for his Brother *Casarius*, *Ambrose* for the Emperors *Valentinian* and *Theodosius*; and St. *Ausline* for his Mother *Monica*. But all the Prayers made for the Dead, by the first Christians, contained no other Petitions for them, than what are very Warrantable and Pious, and which our Liturgy seems, in a great Measure, to authorize, viz. That God would hasten his Kingdom, and speedily give them a Consummation of Bliss not imputing to them their Sins in the day of Judgment; to which they joyned a thankful remembrance of their Virtues and Holy Examples, which they begged Grace to imitate. These with the Alms to the Poor, which generally accompanied them, were the *Oblationes pro mortuis*, spoken of by the Fathers. The *Romish* Church hath abused this Custom, by praying for Persons who died in their Sins, whom they supposed to be detained in their feigned Purgatory; which is contrary to the Doctrine and Practice of the Primitive Church: for they acknowledged no such places as Purgatory, nor Remission of Sins after Death.]

[The Sacrament—a Sacrifice.] The Sacrament was called a Sacrifice by the Primitive Fathers, not because Christ is really sacrificed for the Sins of the Quick and the Dead in those Mysteries, as the *Romish* Church now useth the Word; but because, 1. It is a commemoration of Christ's Spiritual Sacrifice. *Annunciantes mortem Filii Dei, celebramus*, saith St. *Chrysostome*, *incruentum Sacrificium.* 2. Because in the Sacrament we offer the Spiritual Sacrifices of Prayers and Praises. 3. Because the Faithful, at this Sacrament, offered their Souls and Bodies a living and acceptable Sacrifice to God. 4. Because, at these Mysteries, the richer Christians brought an Oblation of Bread and Wine, and other Gifts, which were partly spent in this Service, and partly distributed to the Poor for their Relief. Thus the Fathers used the Word Sacrifice figuratively, which now is understood properly, but contrary to this of *Isidore*.]

the Sacrifice was offered for the Dead. He speaks of the Office of the third, the sixth, the ninth Hour; of *Vespers*, *Compline*, *Vigils*, *Massins*, of the principal Festivals of the year, of Lent-Fast, of the Fast on the 22d. of September, of the Fasts on November the 1st, and January the 1st, of the Fasts on Fridays and Saturdays in some Churches. He observes, that altho' the Custom of the Church was not to fast from *Easter* to *Whitsunday*, some Monks nevertheless did fast in that Interval out of Devotion. Lastly, he owns, that Churches have different Uses and Practices in many things.

The 2d. Book of Offices is concerning Ecclesiastical Persons. He says, all that are ordained to serve the Church, are called * Clerks, because St. *Matthias*, who was the first ordained by the Apostles, was chosen by Lot; or because all Clerks are also called by Lot to the Lord's Inheritance. Or else lastly, because the Lord is their Lot and Portion. He puts them in mind, that they ought to live retired from the World, to abstain from Worldly Pleasures, not to go to the Publick Shows, nor to Publick Feasts; to follow their Employment without engaging themselves in Secular Affairs; not to put Money to Usury; to take no Presents for performing the Functions of their Ministry; to be wise and modest in their Carriage, and reserved in their Talk; not to keep company with Women; to be Sober, Chaste and Constant in Prayer. He distinguisheth two sorts of Clerks; some living under the governance of their Bishops; and others, called * *Acephali*, which can neither pass for Laicks nor Ecclesiasticks. He taketh notice, that all Clerks had a

* Without an Head or Gover- nor.]

[(e) *Tonsure*, and that the Crown of their Head was all Shaved.] *Tonsure*, or cutting the Hair short was in the purest times of the Church imposed upon the Clergy, as being indecent for them to wear their Hair long, according to the Fashion of those times. The 4th. Council of *Carthage*, which was held, A. C. 398. decreed, *Can. 44.* That no Clergyman should wear long Hair or a Beard. *Clericus, nec Comam nutriat, nec barbam*; but on the other side, *Rasure*, or making the Crown of the Head bald by Shaving, was accounted a delectable Ceremony, and much condemned by the Fathers, *Clemens Alex. Optatus Mel. Jerome, Epiphanius, &c.* in the *Donatists*, and other Hereticks, as being forbidden in the Law of God, *Ezek. 44. 20.* and an Heathenish Ceremony derived from the Priests of *Isis* and *Serapis*, *Jerome* in *Ezek. 44.* Wherefore it ought to be looked upon as a corrupt Ceremony, first received by Hereticks, but after got into the Church, among other profane Ulages in this Superstitious Age.]

Clem. A. Pad. l. 1. c. 11. Opt. cont. Parm. lib. 2. Jerom. Com. in Ezek. 44. And so Cont. Tolet.

with the Bishops; that they preside over Churches as they do; that they consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, and preach the Word of God, as they do; but that Ordination is reserved to the Bishops, to maintain the Authority and Splendor of the Priesthood, and to prevent Divisions. Deacons are the Dispensers of the Mysteries consecrated by the *Presbyters*; they give the Cup to the Laity, who may not take it from the Altar. Subdeacons do also handle the Sacred Vessels; also it was decreed, that they also should be bound to Continency. The other Persons of the Clergy are the Readers, the Singers, the Exorcists, the Door-keepers. There are many kinds of Monks. The *Cenobites* are they that live in common; the *Hermites* they that withdraw into Desarts; the *Anchorites* they that shut up themselves in Cells; these are the several sorts of good Monks. St. *Isidore* describes and commends the Life of the *Cenobites*. St. *Isidore* speaks of Penitents; they cut their Hair, they wear Hair-cloth, they strew Ashes upon their Heads, to put them in mind that they are but Dust, and shall return to Dust. By Penance, Remission of Sins committed after Baptism, tho' never so great, is obtained. Clerks do it before God, others before the Bishop. True Penance consists in the Amendment of Life. Afterwards he commends Virgins, and gives them some wholesome Advices; as also Widows, and those that are married, and likewise Catechumens. He gives an account of the Exorcisms and the Salt [used in them.]

Then he passeth to other Points, and expounds the Creed, which he believes to have been composed by the Apostles in common before they dispersed themselves to preach the Gospel. He treats of Baptism, and distinguisheth it into three sorts; the Baptism of Water, the Baptism of Blood, and the Baptism of Tears. He observes, that the Sacrament of Baptism, that it may be valid, must be conferred in the

Name, and by the Invocation of the three Persons of the Trinity: that it is God that baptizeth and not Man, and therefore that it matters not, whether it be conferred by an Heretick; that Original Sin in Infants is remitted in Baptism; so, that if they should die without it, they should be excluded from the Kingdom of Heaven; that Bishops and Presbyters are the Ministers of that Sacrament; that the Holy (f) *Chrism* is given after Baptism, to render the Persons baptized, the anointed of Jesus Christ; and lastly, that the Bishop lays his Hands upon them, that they may receive the Holy Ghost; that Men do not give it, but pray to God to give it; and that the Bishop only may administer that Sacrament.

[(f) *Chrism*.] *Chrism* or *Unction*, was an ancient Rite used in the Jewish Church to denote the conferring of Gifts and Graces on the Persons anointed; and thence derived to the Christian Church. Our Saviour and his Apostles used it in working their miraculous Cures of the Sick, *Jam. 5. 14; Mar. 6. 14.* And after Miracles ceased in the Church; it was continued in the Administration of Baptism, to signify (say the

Fathers) that the Persons baptized are cut off from the wild Olive, and ingrafted into Christ the true Olive-tree, and made Partakers of its Fruits and Benefits: Or to shew, that they were become Champions for Christ, and like the Heathen *Athletes*, were anointed for their spiritual Warfare, or rather to denote their Admission to the great Privileges of Christianity, to be a chosen Generation, a royal Priesthood, an holy Nation (as the Apostle speaks *1 Pet. 2. 9.*) to which all Persons were designed by *Chrism*. The same Ceremony was used by the Church in Confirmation, and to the Sick in the beginning of their Sickness, to strengthen and recover them, but not as it is in the Church of Rome, as a sacramental Viaticum for Persons dying.]

We have a few Letters of St. *Isidore*; the 1st, and 2d. contain nothing remarkable: The 3d. to *Helladius*, is concerning Discipline. There he shews, that a Presbyter fallen into the Sin of the Flesh is to be deposed and put to Penance, without any hope of being restored. He teaches the same Doctrine in his Book of Offices; which shews the Falsity of another Letter fathered upon him, directed to *Massanus*, the Author whereof goes about to expound the Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, about the Deposition of Clerks fallen into the Sin of the Flesh, and to prove it should be understood of those only who do not do Penance, pretending that those that do it, ought to be restored; which Doctrine is so contrary to that of *Isidore*, that there is no doubt, but that Letter is the Fiction of some Impostor, and perhaps of the famous *Isidore Mercator*.

I pass the same Judgment on the 4th. Letter directed to *Claudius*, wherein the Question of the Procession of the Holy Ghost is handled against the *Greeks*; on the 5th. directed to *Redemptus*, in which the Question of unleavened and leavened Bread is debated against the same Persons; and on the last to *Eugenius* of *Toledo*, about the Authority of the Pope. It is visible, these Letters were written in the time of the Quarrel between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, which was not begun in the Life of *Isidore* of *Sevil*.

Lastly, we will join to the Works of Discipline, the Rule of the Monks, composed by St. *Isidore*, accommodated to the use of his Country, and proportion'd to the strength of the weaker sort.

St. *Isidore's* Learning did not hinder him from being eminent in Works of Piety, of which he hath left us these, viz. Two Books of *Synonyma's* or Soliloquies, and a Treatise of the Contempt of the World, which are Discourses supposed to be had in a Man, between his Soul and his Reason, and contain Advices, Instructions, Christian Meditations, Prayers and Sentences of Piety and Remorse. Some body hath made a Collection of some of these Sentences, and intitled it, *The Rule of good Living*. To which is added, a Piece, intitled, *The Lamentations of Repentance*, with a long and good Prayer about Amendment of Life, and another shorter against Temptations.

But the most considerable of the moral Works of St. *Isidore*, is his Collection of Sentences out of St. *Gregory's* [Morals,] divided into three Books. The 1st. contains some Christian Considerations about the Doctrine of the Creed. The 2d. about Virtues. The 3d. about Temptations, and the Remedies whereby we may be healed and sanctified.

The Book of the Combat between Vices and Virtues, attributed to St. *Austine*, to St. *Leo*, to St. *Ambrose*, and at last to St. *Isidore*, is none of theirs, but belongs to *Ambrose Auspert*, Abbot of St. *Vincent* of *Benevent*, as is observed in his Life, tho' *Sigibert* ascribeth to *Isidore* a Book bearing the same Title.

By what we have said of the Works of *Isidore*, it is plain enough, that this Bishop was well read, but he had not so much Finetness of Wit and Elevation of Mind; there is nothing commendable in his Style but the Clearness of it; he is neither eloquent nor polite; his own Opinions are often false, and he does not always make a good Choice when he borrows of others. He contents himself with a superficial Knowledge, and does not search the Bottom of Matters. His Remarks are but trivial, and often mistaken: Nevertheless he was much esteemed, in his Age, a Prodigy of Learning,

Learning, and an Oracle. The Fathers of the 8th. Council of *Toledo*, give this illustrious Testimony of his Knowledge: 'The excellent Doctor of our Age, *Isidore*, the greatest Ornament of the Catholick Church, the last of the Fathers, with regard to the times, but such as may, for his Learning, be compared to the first, the most learned Man of past Ages.' Altho' this Commendation be hyperbolic, yet it must be confessed, *Isidore* was a Man of Desert, and that *Braulio* was in the right, in saying, God seemed to have given him to *Spain*, and raised him up in that time, to make the Monuments of the Ancients known, and to hinder Men from falling into extreme Barbarity and Rutticity.

The Works of this Father have been printed at *Madrid*, in 1599. at *Paris*, by *Sonnus*, by the Care of *La Bigne*, in 1750. in 1601. by *Du Breuil* a *Benedictine* Monk of the Abbey of *St. German*, who having revised them, made a larger Edition of them, printed by *Sonnus*. That Edition was reprinted at *Antwerp*, in 1617. [in Fol.] Besides that, there are many Tracts printed severally. The Origins have been

printed at *Basil*, in 1577. [in Fol.] with some Annotations of *Vulcanius*, and in different Collections, [as at *Venice* in *St. Isidore*. 1483. in Fol. and at *Paris*, in 1509.] his Offices were printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and in some Collections of Books of Ecclesiastical Rites, [at *Rome* in 1591. in Folio, and at *Paris* in 1610.] His Chronicle and Histories were printed at *Francfort*, in 1605. and 1606, at *Hamburg* in 1611, at *Amsterdam* in 1596. [in Octavo.] with *Vulcanius's* Notes; his Allegories at *Hagenau*, in 1529. [Quarto.] His Books against the *Jews* at *Venice*, in 1584. The three Books of Sentences, intituled, *De summo Bono*, Of the sovereign Good at *Paris* in 1538. [at *Turin* in 1593, Quarto, with *Loaysa's* Notes.] Father *Labbe*, in his *Bibliotheca* of Manuscripts hath published a History of the *Goths* and *Vandals*, larger than that printed among the Works of *Isidore*. The Book of the Ecclesiastical Writers was printed in divers Collections of Authors, which have treated of those Matters [at *Antwerp* in 1639, Fol. at *Francfort* in 1603. and with Notes at *Cologne*, in 1580. Octavo.]

B R A U L I O Bishop of Saragosa.

Braulio. **B**raulio, Bishop of *Saragosa*, Friend to *Isidore* of *Sevil*, wrote two Letters to him, and made an Encomium upon that Father, containing the Catalogue of his Works, wherein he tells us, that he not only hath set in order, but finished his Treatise of Origins. He wrote also the Life of *Emilianus* a *Spanish* Hermit, vul-

garly called, *St. Milan*. Moreover the Life of *St. Leocadia* is attributed to him. He was present in the 4th. 5th. and 6th. Councils of *Toledo*, and died in 646. after he had been Bishop 20 Years. [His Epistles and Encomium are extant in *St. Isidore's* Works, and his Life of *Emilianus* in *Maillon's* *Sæc. Ben.* 1. pag. 205.]

St. C O L U M B A N U S.

St. Columbanus. **S**t. *Columbanus*, a Monk of the Monastery of *Bemchor* in *Ireland*, went into *France* towards the Year 590. with 12 Monks of his Monastery, and withdrew himself into the Solitude of *Vosge*, near *Besancon*, where he founded the Monasteries of *Luxeuil* and of *Fonaines*. After he had governed them 20 Years, he was banished by King *Theodorick*, upon the Motion of Queen *Brunebant*. After which, he retired into *Switzerland*, then belonging to the Kingdom of *Theodebert*, where he preached the Gospel to some Pagans remaining in that Country: But *Theodebert* being overcome and taken Prisoner by *Theodorick*, *Columbanus* was forced to fly into *Italy* in the Year 613. where he founded the Monastery of *Bobio*, and died there in 615.

The Author of this Saint's Life, and *Sigibert* of *Gembours*, say, he was a great Student and a witty Man; that in his Youth he composed a Commentary on the Book of *Psalms* which was elegantly written; and that he had published many other Works, useful for Prayers and Instruction. They say, the Title of the Commentary on the *Psalms* is found in an old Catalogue of the Library of *St. Gal*; but the Work it self is not there. In the Monastery of *Luxeuil* there is a Manuscript Commentary on the *Psalms*, the Author of which is not known. Some would have it pass for that of *St. Columbanus*, but it hath not yet been printed, and we know nothing of it, but from him who hath collected the Works of that Father.

There are yet extant some of the poetical Works of *St. Columbanus*, of which *Sigibert* maketh mention. The first of them is a Letter to *Hunaldus* upon the Shortness of Life, and the Vanity of worldly Goods. The Preface of which begins with the Letters of the Name of *St. Columbanus*, and of him he writes to; so that taking all the first Letters of each Verse, one finds *Columbanus Hunaldus*. The 2d. is a Letter in short Verses, written to *Sedulius*; in the end whereof he taketh notice, That he was come to the 18th. Olympiad, that is, that he was 72 Years old at least. The 3d. is an Epigram upon Women. The 4th. is a Poem in Hexameters, intituled, *Monasticon*, containing several Precepts of Morality. The last is in Prose upon the Vanity and Misery of this Life.

But these Works are not comparable to his Rule, which is found in the Collection of *Benedictus Anianus*. It is full of Wisdom and Instruction; for there he does not content himself to prescribe Rules only, but shews the Excellency and Usefulness of them, and grounds them upon Testimonies of Scripture, or upon some Principle of Morality. He lays down for the Foundation of his Rule, the Love of God and of our Neighbour as a general Precept, whereupon all the other are superstructed. Then he commends Obedience and Silence. He appoints, that Monks shall eat in the Evening, and shall feed on such plain Meat; as may sustain them without Hurt to their Health. He will have them to eat every day, that they may be able to pray and to read daily. He orders them to be content with things absolutely necessary, which are very few; to flee from Wealth and Vanity; to be chaste in their Thoughts as well as in their Actions. That which he appoints concerning the Of-

fice which was then called the *Course*, is somewhat obscure. Yet this he seems to prescribe: That they shall meet together three times in the Night, and three times in the day to pray; that in the Office of the day, at each hour they shall say three *Psalms* at each Office, and some other Prayers; that the Night Office is to be lengthened or shortened, according to the length or shortness of the Nights; that from *October* to *February*, they must say in the ordinary Office of the Night, 36 *Psalms* and 12 Anthems, at three several times, and in the rest of the year 24 *Psalms* only, with 8 Anthems; but for the *Saturday* and *Sunday* Night, the Office is made up of 75 *Psalms* and 25 Anthems in Winter; which number is to be augmented or lessened according as the Nights increase or decrease. He observes, some other Monks perform the Night-office at 4 times, and sing both in Winter and Summer, 12 *Psalms* in the usual Service, and 36 in the Service of the *Saturday* and *Sunday* Nights; but he does not approve of that Practice, as being too tiresome in Summer, when the Nights are short. Then he recommends to his Monks that Spirit of Discretion, that can discern betwixt Good and Evil; and that Mortification of Spirit consisting in doing nothing according to Self-will: These are all the Articles of that Rule which were found in the Collection of *Benedictus Anianus*. There is another added to it, of the Perfection of a Monk, from a Manuscript of the Monastery of *Bobio*; but it is evident, that is not the same Author's, but is a Note of some other Monk. Some have thought that we had but one part of *St. Columbanus's* Rule, because that in the Harmony of the Rules there is one Article of it cited, which is said to be the 33d. of that Abbot's Rule; but this is an Error in the Quotation, and it must be taken out of some other Author. After this Rule follows his Penitential, containing a Decree of what Penance is to be imposed upon Monks taken in a Fault, how light soever it may be. It is there supposed, that they must confess it, and then are prescribed Penances for each of those Faults. Some very light ones are punished somewhat severely; one may judge of it by the following Instances: He that shall not say (*Amen*) at Table, shall have six Lashes; he that shall talk in the Refectory, as many; he that shall not forbear Coughing at the beginning of a Psalm, shall also be treated after the same manner; and he likewise that shall touch the Chalice with his Teeth, or shall smile in the time of Divine Service; they that have spoken roughly and frowardly, shall receive fifty Lashes, as well as they that have answered again to their Superior. There are other Penances enjoined besides Whipping; as Fasting, Silence, Separation from the Table, Humiliation. These Penances seem to be more rational, and fitter to correct Men than Whipping, and yet they are not the most common and usual.

There was found in the Manuscript of *Bobio* with *St. Columbanus's* Rule and Penitential, some spiritual Instructions fathered upon this Saint, agreeable enough to the Style of his Rule. They contain some Exhortations to Piety, and a spiritual Life, fit for Monks, the Titles whereof are as follows. 1. Of the Trinity. 2. Of the Mortification of Vices, and the Acquisition of Virtues. 3. Of the Contempt of the World, and the Love of heavenly things. 4. That we ought

St. Columbanus. to work and labour in this Life, to rest in the next. 5. That this Life should not be called Vita but Via. 6. That this Life is like a Shadow. 7. Of the Blindness of those who serve the Flesh and neglect the Spirit. 8. That we ought to tend to our heavenly Country, the End of this present Life. 9. Of the last Judgment. 10. Of the means of fleeing from the dreadful Wrath of him who is to judge us. 11. Of the Love of God and of our Neighbour. 12. Of Remorse, and of the Vigilancy wherewith we ought to wait for the coming of the final Judgment. 13. That we must have Recourse to Christ, the Fountain of Life. 14. Several Advices for the spiritual Life. The 15th. which was not in the Bobio Manuscripts, is of The Fervency wherewith we ought to serve God. There is mention made there of Grace, according to St. Augustine's Principles, but it does not seem to be of the same Style with the rest. The 16th. was not in the said Bobio Manuscript neither, but it hath more of St. Columbanus's Style. It is very short, and is intitled, *What is that which is and which shall be?* In it he compares this Life with that which is to come. The 17th. Instruction is *A Discourse of Faustus Bishop of Ries, to some Monks.*

After the 13th. Instruction, in the Bobio Manuscript, there is a small Tract of the eight principal Vices, which are, Gluttony, Fornication, Covetousness, Wrath, Sorrow, Idleness, Vain-glory and Pride, and sets down in a few Words, some Remedies against these Vices.

Some produce also some Letters of St. Columbanus, taken out of another Manuscript of Bobio, of the Truth of which Letters there can be no doubt. The 1st. is directed to Boniface Bishop of Rome, the third or fourth of that Name. St. Columbanus says, in that Letter, he had already written to the Pope St. Gregory, concerning the Difference between his own Church and that of Rome, about the Day on which Easter ought to be celebrated, and intreats Boniface to let him keep to the Custom he had, of celebrating that Festival, as the Ancients of his Country did, tho' he now lived in France. He propounds the Example of St. Polycarp, and of Anicetus, to shew that Men may differ in their Practice about the keeping of Easter, without any Breach of Unity and Peace, and annexes the Canon of the first Council of Constantinople; whereby it is ordered, that Christian People living among barbarous Nations, shall live after their Customs: Which is an Argument, that St. Columbanus was not unacquainted with Ecclesiastical History, and the Canons of the Church. The next Letter is to a Council of French Bishops, assembled upon his account. It is written with a great deal of Wisdom and Elegancy, is very witty, judicious and learned. He thanks them, at first, for having met together about his Concerns, and intimates to them, that he could wish they would meet oftner, and that, according to the Canons, they would hold Councils once or twice in the Year, to put a stop to the Divisions and Disorders of their time. He prays to God, that their Meeting may be for the Church's good; and that they would not only treat of the Celebration of Easter, but moreover make all necessary Provisions to restore the Discipline to its former State. He does earnestly press their own Duty upon them, and gives them Lessons of Humility and Charitableness, and then, coming to the matter in hand, he sets forth the Difference between the French and the English Bishops, about the time of the Celebration of Easter. He observes, that the Western Churches were not agreed upon the Day of that Festival; That many always kept it from the fourteenth Day of the Moon to the twentieth, so that when the fourteenth fell on a Saturday, they kept the Feast of the Resurrection on the very next Day, whereas the French and Italian Bishops put off the Celebration of it to the Sunday following. He says, that he hath justified the ancient Custom of the Western Churches, in the Writing he sends them, in three other Tracts, directed to Pope Gregory, and in a Book sent to Arigius, one of the Bishops of the Council. But without engaging in that Dispute, he only prays the Bishops to give him leave to observe a Custom, of which he is not the Author, which is practised in the Country from whence he comes, and intreats them that they would let him live in Peace and Silence in his Solitude, near the Bones of seventeen of his Brethren, as he hath lived these 12 years, that he may continue praying for them. He tells them, that it were better done of them to comfort poor old Men and Strangers, than to trouble and molest them. He adds, that he durst not go to the Council, for fear he should be forced to engage in the Dispute, but that he cannot forbear declaring sincerely to them, that he gives more Credit to the Tradition of his Country, to the ancient Cycle of fourscore and four years, to that of Anatolius, to Eusebius and St. Hierom, than to Victorinus's Testimony, a new Author, who hath written very obscurely: Nevertheless, he would not have them to think, that he says this out of a contentious Spirit, he desires only, that every one might keep his own Custom, and follow his own Tradition. Then he exhorts them to the Practice of Humility and Charity. He makes a Comparison of the Monks and Bishops, and says, St. Hierom advises these to imitate the Apostles, and those to follow the Holy Fathers, because Clerks and Monks

have very different Practices and Obligations; that every one is to follow his Calling, and perform his Duty. He St. Columbanus prays to God, that through his free Grace he would cause his Commandments to be kept by all. In the end, he does beseech them to pray to God for him and his Fellows, as they pray for them, and not to look upon them as Strangers, seeing all Christians are Members of one Body.

It is not known what this Council is, it must have been held towards the year 600. because it is 12 years after St. Columbanus's Coming into France, a little before St. Gregory's Death: Some believe it to be the Council held at Chalhon, upon the River Soane, in the year 603. in which Arigius Bishop of Lyons presided: But perhaps it might be some other Council: For this was assembled about the Business of Desiderius Bishop of Vienna. This Letter is written before the foregoing.

St. Columbanus's Letter has lately been attributed to St. Gregory, who is mentioned in the two preceding Letters: There he does very confidently set down the Authorities he depends upon, to shew that Easter should always be celebrated by the twentieth of the Moon in March, before the Equinox, and treats the Cycle of Victorinus with a great deal of Contempt: And does also refute Pope Victor's Opinion, that Easter is not to be kept at the same time with the Jews: He exhorts the Pope to alter his Opinion and Practice about that; and then asks him, whether he should communicate with those who are ordained Bishops, contrary to the Constitutions and Canons, by Simony; or having committed some Crimes in the time they were Deacons? In fine, he consults him what is to be done with Monks, who depart from their Monasteries, without their Abbot's Leave, renouncing their Vows. He lets him know, he would gladly have come to Rome to see him. He commends his Pastoral, and prays him to send him some of his Works, and chiefly those upon Ezekiel. He acquaints him, that he hath perused the six Books of St. Hierom on that Prophet; but that that Father hath not explained half of it.

St. Columbanus's fourth Letter is written to Pope Boniface IV. of that Name, upon the Motion of Agilolphus King of Lombardy: By this Letter it appears, that that Prince assisted the Defenders of the three Chapters, and that he had persuaded St. Columbanus, that there was some cause to suspect the Church of Rome of Error; that the Pope himself was consenting to it, or at least permitted it; that Vigilins dyed an Heretick; and that the fifth Council ought to be rejected. St. Columbanus entertaining these Opinions, writes a vehement Letter to Boniface; wherein he exhorts him to watch over his Flock, and condemns Vigilins's want of Vigilancy. He saith, he died an Heretick, and wonders they should put his Name in the List of Catholick Bishops. He exhorts the Pope to clear both himself and his Church from the Suspicion of Heresie, by calling a Council, to make an exact Exposition of the Catholick Faith, and to condemn all those that swerved from it. He believes, that the Fifth Council approved Eutyches's Error, and confounds the two Natures; and yet he says, at his coming into Italy, they wrote to him, that Communion with Rome ought to be shun'd, because they there held Nestorius's Heresy: Which shews, he was not rightly informed of the Fact he wrote of. It had been better for him to have only exhorted the Pope, as he does, to endeavour to suppress the Schism and Division in Italy, about the Business of the three Chapters, by tolerating those that defended them.

'Tis said, that St. Columbanus had written some Letters to King Theodorick, but we have none of them. Jonas speaks also of a Letter directed to Clotharius; but it is lost, as well as his Book against the Arians, mentioned in the same Author, his great Treatise of Easter, two Letters to St. Gregory, and his Writing to Arigius upon the same Subject. They say, moreover, he had made a Commentary upon the Gospels, but it is not mentioned in ancient Authors. They ascribe yet to him a little Treatise of Penances for Monks, Clerks and Laicks; but it does not seem to me to be his. Father Flemingue, an Irish Franciscan, hath collected the Works of this Father, and printed them at Louvain, in the year 1667. since which they have been printed in the last Edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* at Lyons, with the Works of two other Irish Writers.

The first of which is a Tract of St. Aleran, or Ereran, containing a mystical and moral Interpretation of the Names recited in the Genealogy of Christ, which are applied to our Lord's Qualities or Precepts. This Aleran, surnamed the Wise, was a Presbyter; it is said, he also wrote the Life of St. Patrick. There is another Ereran, an Irish Abbot, who wrote a Monastical Rule.

The second Tract added to St. Columbanus's Works in this Edition, is a very large Penitential of one Cumianus or Cuminus, an Abbot, in which there are several remarkable Things, and amongst others, that there are 12 principal Means of obtaining Pardon of our Sins, grounded upon Testimonies of the Holy Scripture, viz. 1. Baptism, 2. Charity, 3. Almsgiving, 4. Tears, 5. Confession, 6. Mortification of the Flesh and Spirit, 7. Change of Manners, 8. Intercessions of the Just, 9. Faith, 10. Converting of others, Forgiving

Forgiving of Enemies, and

St. Columbanus.

1 Joh. 19.

Matt. 5. 23.

Matt. 3. 6.

Cyprian,

Serm. de

12. Ter-

tull. de pæ-

nitentia.

Origen in

Ps. 37.

[(e) Confession of secret Sins and Thoughts—was in use.]

Confession of Sins, private and publick, to God, is absolutely necessary to obtain Pardon of them, and where we have done any Wrongs or Injuries to Men, we must acknowledge them, and making Restitution, endeavour Reconciliation. And if still there remain any Doubts and Scruples in our Consciences, it is convenient to discover our Grievs, to the Ministers of God's Word, that we may receive from them Ghostly Counsel and Advice. In these Cases, no doubt, the Confession of secret Sins, Thoughts and Desires was ever in use in the Church: But as to that Auricular and Sacramental Confession, which seems to be insinuated in the Words of this Father; as it was not in use in the first Ages of the Church, so can it pretend to no other Ground for the use of it, than the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent the third*, anno 1215. or the *Council of Trent*, which is of much later date. Confession of secret Sins was ever approved and used, never generally imposed nor made necessary to Absolution till Popery prevailed.]

[(f) Celibacy of Clerks—commanded.] Altho' the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament do no where disallow the Marriage of Priests, but give them an equal Liber-

ty, in that kind, with the Laity, insomuch, that all the Apostles (except St. John) were married Men, as also the greatest part of the Clergy of the Athan. Ep. first Times: But yet some there were of the most eminent Bishops and most zealous Christians, who having imbibed the Philosophers Opinions and Prejudices against Marriage, as an Estate in it self unclean, and so troublesome, that it was utterly inconsistent with an Holy and Speculative Life, did ever retain such an Antipathy against it, especially in the Clergy, that they were ever inveighing against them that were married, insomuch that they brought it into a general Dislike. At length a Decree was made against Priests Marriage, in the Council of *Eliberis*, anno 305. And the like was attempted in the first Council of *Nice*, but was suppressed by the Authority of *Paphnutius*: And not long after, the Canon made at *Eliberis* was as it were reversed by the Council of *Ancyra*, anno 380. and *Innocent*, enforced the same Prohibition in the West, and were seconded by the second Council of *Carthage*, but were opposed by the Synods of *Agatha* and *Tyron*: So that tho' the Celibacy of the Clergy was commanded and practised in some Churches, especially in the West, (to which this Author refers himself) yet it was never universally imposed nor received, especially in the East, till *Gregory VII's* Time, anno 1074. and then was thought to be established by no Law Ecclesiastical or Divine, and was opposed by the Clergy, unanimously, as a Doctrine of Devils, as St. Paul, 1. Tim. 3, 4. and all good Men esteem it.]

Cup fall to the Ground, or were guilty of any other Irreverence, at the receiving of the Sacrament, out of Negligence or by Accident; that among the *Greeks* they received the Communion every Sunday, and that those who did not receive for three Sundays together were excommunicated; but that among the *Latins* every one had liberty to communicate or not to communicate; that the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for the Dead, and that they did even fast for them; that Women might receive the Sacrament with a black Veil on; that Bishops were permitted to give Confirmation in a Campaign; that a Priest might in one Day say two Masses at the same Altar; that, in case of necessity, Confession may be made to God; that the most usual Penances were Fasting, Separation from the Church, and Entrance into Religious Orders.

same Prohibition in the West, and were seconded by the second Council of *Carthage*, but were opposed by the Synods of *Agatha* and *Tyron*: So that tho' the Celibacy of the Clergy was commanded and practised in some Churches, especially in the West, (to which this Author refers himself) yet it was never universally imposed nor received, especially in the East, till *Gregory VII's* Time, anno 1074. and then was thought to be established by no Law Ecclesiastical or Divine, and was opposed by the Clergy, unanimously, as a Doctrine of Devils, as St. Paul, 1. Tim. 3, 4. and all good Men esteem it.]

CUMIANUS or CUMINUS.

Cuminus.

[*Epi-

scopus Hiber-

norum]

Epistola]

de Dalmatia]

Here are many *Cuminus's* in Ireland. This probably is he, of whom there is still extant a Letter to *Segenius*, Abbot of *Hi*, published by Bishop *Ulber*, in his *Collection of Letters of Irish Men, wherein he would persuade the *Irish*, that they ought to leave their Custom of keeping *Easter*, and conform to that of the *Roman Church*. The Author of the Penitential is of the same Opinion; and therefore may be believed to be the same Man, but it is not known who nor whence he was: Some believe 'tis *Cuminus*, Abbot of *Hi*; but it is not like-

ly, seeing the Letter is written to *Segenius*, who was Abbot of *Hi*, many years before this *Cuminus* took Possession of it. I should rather think 'tis *Cuminus*, surnamed *Fada*, that is, the long, Son to King *Fiachna*, who also is supposed to be Author of an Hymn, which begins with these Words; *Celebra Juda festa Christi gaudia*. He was born, if one may believe the Annals of that Country, in the year 592, and died 662. The Letter now mentioned was written about 634.

HESYCHIUS.

Hesychnus.

[*A City

of Dalmatia]

Authors are much divided about this Author's Age and Profession, whose chief Work is a Commentary upon *Leviticus*. Cardinal *Perron* ascribed it to *Hesychnus*, Bishop of **Salone*, who lived under the Empire of *Honorius*, in the Time of Pope *Zosimus*, and of St. *Anastine*, because there is a Letter of that Pope directed to this *Hesychnus* Bishop of *Salone*, and a Letter of that Bishop to St. *Anastine*. *Trithemius* and *Sixtus Senensis* did believe, that this we now speak of, was a Disciple of St. *Gregory Nazianzen*. *Bellarmino*, *Possessin* and *Miræus* ascribe the Works, bearing *Hesychnus's* Name, to *Hesychnus*, Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, to whom the fourth Letter of the first Book of St. *Gregory's* Letters is directed. The most common Opinion is, that this *Hesychnus* was a Priest only, and of *Jerusalem* (but some place him in the Fifth, others in the Seventh Century, which is plain) for 1. The Author discovers himself to be so, in the Preface and Book which he wrote at *Jerusalem* (a). And 2. in an old Manuscript of the King's Library, it is observed in the Title, that this *Hesychnus* was of *Jerusalem*; and the Title of the Letter, which is instead of a Preface, shews he was but a Priest. It is worded thus; *To the Deacon Eutychianus, Isychius, a Sinner, servant of Jesus Christ and Presbyter*: Notwithstanding which, he might possibly have been afterward raised to the Dignity of Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; but there are no other Proofs of it, but the Authority of some Manuscripts, and some new Authors, in the Title of which he is called by the Name of Bishop; which is not very convincing: And *Photius*, who made

some Extracts of this Author's Sermons, calls him no other than Presbyter. As for the time in which he lived, there's no question but he is much later than the Bishop of *Salone*, seeing he writes against the *Eutychians* and *Nestorians*: Nay, he seems to have lived after St. *Gregory*, because he maketh use of St. *Hierom's* Translation; but he was before the Ninth Century, because his Commentary is quoted by *Amalarius*, l. 14. of Divine Offices, c. 36. and by *Rabanus*, in his Preface upon *Leviticus*, as well as by *Freculphus* and *Strabo*; yea, and before the Eighth, if he be the same which *Photius* quoteth, as very likely he is: Which makes me think, he lived in the End of the Sixth or in the Beginning of the Seventh Century: It is true, there was one *Hesychnus*, Priest of *Jerusalem*, in the Fifth Century, in the Time of St. *Cyril*, mentioned in *Euthemius's* Life, and in *Theophanes's* Chronicle; but this does not seem to be so ancient, for in St. *Cyril's* Time St. *Hierom's* Translation was not used in the Church. I know, it may be answer'd, that that Quotation is none of that Author's, but the Translator's, because we have not the Greek Original of that Work: But I am persuaded, it was written in Latin by its Author, who does carefully mark the Differences between the Vulgar Edition and that of the *Septuagint*, and likewise of the Translations of *Aquila* and *Theodotion*, and sometimes quotes the Greek Terms of those Translations, which he renders into Latin. This Commentary is clear and plain, he gives the literal Sense, adding now and then to that Explication, some short Allegorical or Moral Reflections. It

(a) Which he wrote at Jerusalem.] These are his Words in the Preface: *Deprecare ut fiat oblatio verbi mei acceptabilis, non solum in Jerusalem, sed et in omni terra*. And in the sixth Book, *Quod manifestat Templum, et civitas hac Jeru-*

salem. And in the seventh Book, *Cognoscis autem ea quæ ipsis Judæis eveniunt, ex Josephi historia, quorum plurima etiam nunc nostris ad cernendum adjacent visibus*.

Hefychius. is divided into seven Books, it hath often been observ'd, that this Author speaks of a Practice of the Church of his Time: That they burnt the remainder of the Oblation after the Celebration of the Mysteries, and the Communion of the Faithful.

In the *Bibliotheca Patrum* there are Two Homilies in Greek and Latin, upon the Virgin, bearing the Name of *Hefychius*, Presbyter of Jerusalem.

Combes attributes, moreover, to this Author, the second Sermon of St. Gregory of Nyssa, upon Christ's Resurrection; and he proves his Opinion. 1. By the Authority of a Manuscript of the King's Library, where this Sermon is found under *Hefychius's* Name, Priest of Jerusalem. 2. Because it seems to be of a meaner, more close and dogmatical Style than that of St. Gregory of Nyssa. Lastly, because it sets down an Opinion directly opposite to that which is brought in the first Sermon on the same subject, bearing also the Name of St. Gregory of Nyssa; for the Author of this supposes, that Christ rose from the Dead on Saturday in the Evening, and gives that Sense to St. Matthew's Words, *Vespere autem Sabbathi*: Whereas the Author of the second Sermon supposes, That he arose on Sunday Morning, and shews these Words (*Vespere autem Sabbathi*, or *Sabbathorum*) are to be understood thus, *When the Week was past*. But if this Homily be *Hefychius's*, it is not his of whom we speak, but his who lived in the Beginning of the Fifth Century. To the End of that Homily *Combes* hath added the Fragment of a Place of *Hefychius's* Harmony of the Gospels, touching the Hour of Christ's Death. *Cotelerius* hath made an Abridgement of it in the beginning of his third Volume *Of the Monuments of the Greek Church*. This Work contains the solutions of several Difficulties about the seeming Contradictions of the Evangelists.

Hoeschelius hath published, with *Adrian's* Introduction, the Titles of the Chapters of the twelve lesser Prophets, and of *Isaiah*, bearing the Name of *Hefychius* also. This Work might also be his, who lived in the fifth Century.

The Treatise of Temperance and Virtue, dedicated to *Theodulus*, which contains two hundred Maxims of the Spiritual Life, is the same *Hefychius's*, for in the Thirty first Maxim of the first hundred, it is observed, that the Author dwelt in a Monastery, and lived under the Conduct of a Superior.

It is probable likewise that *Hefychius's* Church-History, a Fragment whereof is quoted about *Theodorus Mopsueste-* *Hefychius.* nus, in the fifth Council, Collection V. p. 470. and in *Justinian's* Edict, belongs to the Monks of the fifth Century.

Lastly, we may attribute to this the two Sermons, of which *Photius* recites some Fragments in the 269th, and 275th. Volumes of his *Bibliotheca*: The one is taken out of a Sermon upon St. Andrew, and the other out of a Sermon upon St. James, the Lord's Brother: I say the first is taken out of a Sermon upon St. Andrew, tho' in *Photius's* Title there is the Name of St. Thomas, because the Extract contains really a commendation of St. Andrew, and there is now extant a Latin Translation of that whole Discourse on St. Andrew, in which *Photius's* Extracts are found. He says, in that Sermon, That St. Andrew is the first of the Apostles, the first Pillar of the Church, even before St. Peter, the Foundation of the Foundation it self. In the Sermon upon St. James, he says also almost the same things of that Apostle, calling him, the Prince of Bishops, the Head or Chief of the Apostles, the Top of the Heads themselves, the most shining Lamp, the brightest Star. Thus they always extol the Saint, of whom they speak, above the others. *Cotelerius* tells us, in his Notes, he had collected many other Manuscript Pieces of this *Hefychius*, which he would have publish'd, if he could have hoped for a Life long enough.

There was another *Hefychius*, Presbyter of Constantinople, mention'd also by *Photius* in the 51st. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*. 'I have read, says he, four Discourses of *Hefychius's*, Presbyter of Constantinople, upon the Brazen Serpent: The Style of them is full of Ostentation, and calculated to stir up the Passions. He brings in the People of Israel speaking to Moses, and that Prophet making Speeches to the People. He relates also some Discourses of God to the People, and to Moses, and the Answers of Moses and the People, in the Form of Prayers or Excuses. These Speeches take up the greatest part of his Work, which maketh up a large Volume.' That Author was Catholic, as far as one can judge by his Work.

We have none of those Discourses now, nor any Tract of that Author, but the loss of these Declamations is not very considerable.

EUSEBIUS, Bishop of Thessalonica.

Eusebius. His Bishop having sent to St. Gregory, his Reader *Theodorus*, with some Writings, he gave them to a Monk, named Andrew, whom he had formerly been acquainted with, who was shut up in a Monastery of Rome. This Monk, who was of the *Sect of those who believed Christ's Flesh was always incorruptible, falsified them, so that it seemed as if this Bishop had advanced same heretical Propositions: But St. Gregory knowing the Genius of that Monk, because he had made some Greek Sermons under his Name, discovered that Fraud, and wrote about it to *Eusebius* of Thessalonica, as it appears by the 69th. Letter of the Ninth Book of that Pope's Letters. *Photius* tells us, that same Monk had written a Letter to *Eusebius*, and pray'd him for God's sake to read it; and that *Eusebius* having read it, wrote him an Answer, in which he shews him at first that he knew not how to write, and that he continually committed many Faults wherein he was so much the more to blame because he forsook his Profession, and disturbed the Privacy which he had embraced, to carry on a Business which he was not at all fit for: He then attacks his Error, and shews first, against him, that the Word Corruption is not only apply'd to Sin, but the Holy Fathers used it to signify the Dissolution of Bodies. 2. He reprov'd him for having maintained, that Christ's Body became incorruptible at the Moment of its Union to the God-head, an Opinion which was indeed *Julian's* (Bishop of *Halicarnassus*, turn'd out of his See by *Justinian*, for rejecting the Council of Chalcedon) tho' *Andrew* pretended to write in that Letter against the Errors of *Severus* and *Julian*. The 3d. Error he charged that Monk with, was of having said, that Adam's Body, before his Fall, was not

created mortal and corruptible, when as he should have said, That Man in his Nature was mortal and subject to Pain, but should by Grace have been preserved from Death and Sickness, had he not fallen. The 4th. Proposition he found fault with, in *Andrew's* Letter, was, that he had written, That the World was incorruptible: He did also confute some more of *Andrew's* Propositions in that Writing, and exhorted him to a Retraction. But this Monk, instead of following that Advice, made presently another Book, to defend his Errors, against which *Eusebius* wrote ten Books; wherein he shew'd, that *Andrew*, out of an intolerable Boldness, had gone about to make a new Exposition of Faith, whereas he should have kept to those made by the Councils; and that he had adulterated and misquoted many Passages of the Fathers. Then he confuted the four principal Errors, he had condemn'd in his first Writing. He shewed the different Senses the Word Corruption is capable of, and how many ways it hath been taken. He cited several Places of the Fathers, for the confuting of those Errors, and laid open the Falsifications of the Places quoted by *Andrew*. He shew'd, that Christ was subject to natural, tho' not to vicious Passions, during his abode on the Earth, and that after his Resurrection he is become immortal and impassible. He did not matter the Name of *Phthartolatre*, that is, *Worshipper of Corruption*, which *Andrew* gave to the Catholics, and omitted nothing that was necessary to maintain the Doctrine of the Church, and to render that of his Adversary ridiculous. His Style was plain and clear, pure enough, and did not want Judgment. There is nothing of him now extant. This is gathered out of the 162d. Volume of *Photius's* *Bibliotheca*.

BONIFACE IV.

Boniface IV. *Boniface IV.* held the Roman See from 607. to 614. *Bede* says, that in that Pope's Time, *Mellitus* Bishop of London came to Rome, in the eighth Year of the Emperor *Phocas*, and that he was present at a Council, which this Pope held at Rome, in the Year 608. in February; in which they made some Constitutions for the Church of England. *Holfstenius* hath published a pretended Decree of this Council, wherein it declares, That Monks may be Bishops, and perform the Sacerdotal Functions; and a Letter of this Pope to **Athelbert*, a King of England, in which he declares all those excommunicated

that shall hinder the Execution of the Decree now mentioned, even the King's, *Athelbert's* Successors. These two Monuments seem very suspicious to me. The Style of them is altogether barbarous; and they are fill'd with impertinent and frivolous reasons: For instance he says, it is evident that the state and profession of Monks maketh them fit to be Ministers of the Word of God, seeing they are called Angels, and Angels are Ministers, which Reasoning is frivolous; but the reason he gives why they are called Angels, is yet more ridiculous. Monks, saith he, are cover'd, like Cherubims, with six Wings, the Cowle that covers their

Boniface IV. Head, maketh two, the Tunick's Arms make other two, and we may confidently say, the two Extrems of the Habit, which covers the Body, are two Wings more. Thus you have the Cherubims six Wings: This is some Monk's Fancy, rather than the Work of a Council of Bishops, or of a Patriarch.

The Letter of Pope *Deusdedit*, *Boniface* the IV's Successor directed to *Gordian* Bishop of *Sevil*, is a Monument evidently false. *Isidore* was Bishop of *Sevil* from the Year 600. to the Year 636. and *Deusdedit* held the Holy See in that

interval. Thus the very Title does evince the Falsity of that Letter, it being evident that under *Deusdedit's* Pontificate, there was no *Gordian* Bishop of *Sevil*. The Author IV. of that Letter declares that according to the Decrees of the Holy See, married Persons, which accidentally stood together Suraties for their Children at the Font, ought to be put asunder, and may be married again; which is a gross Error, authorized by no ancient Constitution. In fine, the Style of this Letter is the same with the Pope's other Letters, forg'd by *Isidore*.

JOHN PHILOPONUS.

John Philoponus. *John*, surnamed *Philoponus*, that is, Laborious, a Grammarian of *Alexandria*, of the Sect of the *Trisheites*, flourish'd in the beginning of the Seventh Century, and composed several Books.

The first is a Writing against *Jamblicus* the Philosopher's Treatise of Idols. That Philosopher had undertaken in that Treatise, to shew, that Idols had something Heavenly in them, and that the Deity dwelt there; which he prov'd both from the wonderful Fabrick of Images, and the Incredible things ascribed to them. *Philoponus* had refuted the two Parts of that Work with a great deal of Elegancy and Strength. *Photius* speaks of that Work in the 216th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*.

He wrote moreover a Treatise of the six Days Work against *Theodorus Mopsuestenus*, dedicated to *Sergius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*; wherein he endeavours to demonstrate, That *Moses* hath related the History of the Creation of the World more plainly and conformably to the *Phænomena's* of Nature than any thing *Plato* said of it. *Photius* mentions that Treatise in the 43d. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*, and there is an Extract of it found in the 240th.

Volume. It is divided into four Books, publish'd by *Corde-lopous*, and printed at *Vienna*, in the Year 1630. in *Quarto*, together with a Tract of the same Author about *Easter*, whereof there is no Mention made in *Photius*, who speaks of three Works more of the same Author. The first is a Treatise of the Resurrection, wherein he rejected the Resurrection of the Body. The second is a Writing against the * fourth Council, divided into four Parts; in which he maintains, that the Bishops of that Assembly approved *Nestorius's* Doctrine. And another Treatise against the Catechetical Discourse of *Joannes Scholasticus*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, concerning the Holy and Consubstantial Trinity, preach'd under the Empire of *Justin junior*. He hath also written several other Philosophical Treatises † upon *Aristotle's* Books, printed in several Places, and a Treatise against *Proclus's* Opinion of the Eternity of the World.

This Author was as pure pleasing and elegant in his Style, as impious in his Doctrine, and weak in his Reasonings. One may see by this Treatise of *Easter* that in his Time the *Greeks* used Leavened Bread in the Eucharist. Printed at Venice in Gr. in 1535, 1551.]

THEODOSIUS, CONON, EUGENIUS, THEMISTIUS and THEODORUS.

Theodosius, Conon, Eugenius, Themistius, Theodorus. *Philoponus's* Treatise of the Resurrection was confuted by *Theodosius* the Monk, by *Conon*, *Eugenius* and *Themistius*. These three last made a Book, intituled, *An Invektive*, in which they treated him as a Man unworthy the Name of a Christian, tho' they agreed with him in not receiving the Council of *Chalcedon*. This *Themistius* seems to be that Heretick whose Fragments are found quoted in the sixth Council who was of the Sect of the *Agnoetae*, and had written an Apology for *St. Theophobius*.

us; against which another Monk, named *Theodorus*, of the Sect of * those who said the Deity had suffer'd, writ a Book; in which he did refute the four Arguments urg'd by *Theodorus*, to prove that Christ was subject to Ignorance. *Theodorus* wrote an Answer to that Work, to which *Theodorus* oppos'd three other Books. *Photius* saith, they did both of them write indifferent clear and strong. See the 23d. 24th, and 108th. Volumes of his *Bibliotheca*, for we have not now these Works. [† *Theopaschita*.]

NICIAS.

Nicias. Here is another Adversary of *Philoponus*; he was call'd *Nicias*, and was a Monk: He composed a Book against the seven Articles of *Philoponus*, mention'd in his Book, intituled, the *Arbiter*, or

the Judge. His Style was plain and concise, his Answers satisfactory, and all to the purpose. He hath also made a Treatise against *Severus*, and two Books against the *Pagans*. See *Photius* in the 50th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*.

ANTI OCHUS.

Antiochus. *Antiochus*, a Monk of the Monastery of *St. Sabas* in *Palestina* liv'd in the beginning of the seventh Century, when *Jerusalem* was taken by *Chosroes* King of *Persia*, and *Palestine* pillaged by the *Saracens*. He hath made a Book, intituled, *A Pandect of the Holy Scripture*, because it is made up of 190 Moral Discourses; containing Precepts and Maxims upon the principal Duties of a Christian, grounded upon Places of the Holy Scripture. In the 130th, he maketh the Catalogue of Heresies related by *St. Epiphanius*, to which he adds the Names of the

Authors of Heresies, who appeared since. In the End there is a long Prayer intituled, *Exomologesis*, to beg of God that he would turn away his wrath from his People. The Preface speaks of the Taking of *Jerusalem*, and with what cruelties the *Saracens* used the Monks of *Palestina*. This Treatise is in *Greek* and *Latin*, in the first Addition to the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, and, in *Latin* alone, in the last *Bibliotheca*, in which they have put the 81st. Discourse, under another Title.

JOHN Bishop of Thessalonica.

John of Thessalonica. This Bishop, who is quoted in the 7th. Council, hath left us an Homily upon those Women that carried the Perfumes to imbalm Christ's Corpse. In that Homily he maketh divers Remarks, to set forth the Circumstances of our Lord's Resurrection: These are some of them. He saith those Women came the Night between the *Saturday* and *Sunday* to Christ's Tomb; That *Mary*, the Mother of *James*, was the Mother of Christ, so called, because she was Mother-in-Law to *James*, the Lord's Brother, that is, *Joseph's* Son by a former Wife; That she that accompanied her, was *Mary Magdalen*; That they found Christ risen; That the Hour of his Resurrection is, uncer-

tain; That *Mary Magdalen* went a second time to Christ's Tomb, with other Women, very early; That she returned thither twice more; That the four Evangelists speak of four different Journeys of the Women to the Tomb; That there are five or six *Maries*; *Mary Magdalen*, out of whom Christ had cast seven Devils; *Mary* the Mother of *James*, which is the Virgin-Mother of God, Mother-in-Law to *James* the Greater; *Mary*, the Mother of *James* the Lesser, and of *Joses*; *Mary*, the Wife of *Cleophas*, the Virgin's Sister; and *Mary*, *Martha's* and *Lazarus's* Sister. The distinction of these *Maries* may have some ground; but the four Journeys to Christ's Tomb, are a conjecture without probability.

ty. This Homily hath already been publish'd in *Greek* by *John*. Sir *H. Sevil*, among the Supposititious Homilies of *St. Chrysofome*; and *Combes* hath publish'd it with a Translation out of a Manuscript, in which it is attributed to *John*, Bishop of *Theffalonica*. He had found out one more, upon the Virgin's Assumption, little differing from the Writing attributed to *Melito*, but he did not judge it worth publishing. In the 7th. Council, *Act*. 4. are found some Fragments of *John* of *Theffalonica*'s Dialogues, the first whereof was between a *Gentile* and a *Catholic*, and the second between a *Jew* and a *Christian*. In the 1st. he proves against the *Gentile*, That Angels and Souls may be painted, as being corporeal; and in the 2d. he shews,

[(b) Pictures of Christ and of the Martyrs, which were in use among Christians, are not Idols.] The Charge of Idolatry, being so great a Crime, so stupid a Sin, and so strictly forbidden in Holy Scripture, hath always been denied by the rankest Image-worshippers among Christians, and that with much seeming detestation.

Conc. Nic. 2. *An.* 788. The Fathers of the second Council of *Nice*, who were strenuous Patrons of Image-worship against the Iconoclasts of that time, did yet disclaim that Charge lately laid upon them by a Council of *Constantinople*, tho' the reasons brought to clear themselves of

it are very weak and frivolous, as the most learned Bishop of *Worcester* hath sufficiently evinced. Nor doth the Church of *Rome*, tho' as gross Idolaters as the Heathens themselves, seem to bear any Impeachment more grievous than of Idolatry. And then *Still*. *Idol.* 'tis no wonder, that this Writer, who perhaps was guilty of c. 1. p. 68. the same Sin, should assert, that the Pictures, then in use among Christians, were no Idols. And indeed as they were used by the Church at first from the year 380. to *St. Gregory* the conf. *Evangel.* Great's time, viz. To represent the History of the Bible to the illiterate and ignorant Laity, or to adorn the Church withal, *Basil. Orat.* we do not account them Idols; tho' as the Christians for the first in *S. Barla.* 300 years and more, would not endure any Pictures in their Churches, witness that zealous Fact of *Epiphanius* in the Church of *Anabathla*; so it may reasonably be thought, it was the Foundation of that Image-worship, which soon followed in the more superstitious Ages. And if the Christians, of whom this Bishop speaks, made no other use of them, we acknowledge, that they are not Idols. But if the Pictures of Christ and his Martyrs were worshipped by those Christians of whom he speaks, according to the custom of those times, it will be impossible to excuse them from Idolatry, notwithstanding the distinctions made by the Image-worshippers, between an Image and an Idol; *Isa.* 44. 9. for in Holy Scripture, every Image being bowed down to and worshipped, tho' but with a relative Worship, is thereby made an Idol.

GREGORY of Antioch.

Gregory. **G**regory Bishop of *Antioch*, who sat in that See from the year 572 to the year 608. made a Discourse upon the same Subject; but it is less Dogmatical, and contains nothing but Prosopopœia's of *Joseph* to *Pilate*, and of *Pilate* to the *Jews*; some Reflections of

Death speaking to her self, and Complaints of the Women upon Christ's death; some Discourses of the Angel with the *Jews* and Women, and of *Jesus Christ* with those Women.

JOHN, ARAUSIUS, HELLADIUS, JUSTUS, NONNITUS, and CONANTIUS, Bishops of Spain.

John, &c. **J**ohn, an Abbot and afterwards Bishop of *Saragosa*, *Braulio*'s Brother flourish'd towards the year 620. *Ildephonsus* assures us, that he was well read in the Holy Scripture, and that he laboured to instruct by his Discourses more than by his Writings; that nevertheless he had elegantly written some Prayers to be sung in Divine Service, and also a Table to find out *Easter-day* every Year. We have nothing now of this Author.

The same *Ildephonsus* ranks among Ecclesiastical Authors, *Arausius* Bishop of *Toledo*, and his Successor *Helladius*; but seeing he confesseth, they have writ nothing, it was needless to encrease the number of Authors with them. This last had for his Disciple and Successor, one named *Justus*, a witty and worthy Man, who had written a Letter to *Richilan*, Abbot of the Monastery of *Agali*, in which he shew-

ed him, that he ought not to leave his Flock. These three Bishops govern'd the Church of *Toledo* from the Year 606, to 634, or 635. This last signed the Council of *Toledo* held under *Sisenand*, in the year 633. and was but three years Bishop.

St. Ildephonsus puts also in the rank of Ecclesiastical Authors *Nonnitus*, Bishop of *Gironde*, who lived in the same time, but he speaks of none of his Works.

He speaks, lastly, of *Conantius*, Bishop of *Palenzo*, as of a Man as Prudent and Grave, as Eloquent and Learned; and he saith, he applied himself to regulate the Order of Divine Service; that he had made Hymns to new Tunes, and a Book of Prayers taken out of the *Psalms*. We have not now those Works.

BONIFACE V.

Bonif. V. **B**ede mentions three Letters of this Pope about the Conversion of the *English*. The 1st. is directed to *Justus*, who from Bishop of *Rochester* became Archbishop of *Canterbury*, wherein he grants him the Pall, and congratulates him for King *Adelvaad*'s Conversion. [* King of *Northumberland*.] [† Wife of *K. Edwin*.]

The 2d. is directed to * *Edwin* an *English* King, wherein he exhorts him to leave Idolatry, to worship the true God, and embrace Christ's Religion. The 3d. is to Queen *Edelburg*, whom he congratulateth upon her Conversion, and exhorts her to endeavour that of the King her Husband.

MODESTUS, Bishop of Jerusalem.

Modestus. **W**E have no other Monument of this Author, who flourish'd towards the year 620; but an Extract of one of his Sermons mentioned by *Photius* in the 275th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*. The first is taken out of a Sermon upon the Women of the Gospel which carried Balm to anoint Christ. He tells us there, that *Mary Magdalen*, out of whom Christ cast seven Devils, was a Virgin, and that she suffer'd Martyrdom at *Ephesus*, whither she went to *St. John* the Evangelist, after the Virgin's death. Which shews how far they were then from the Opinion which hath obtained since, that *Mary Magdalen* is the same with the Woman that was a Sinner, [*Luke* 7.

37.] The 2d. Sermon of *Modestus*, mentioned in *Photius*, was a Sermon upon the death of the Virgin, the Mother of God, which he calls, *A Dormitory Sermon after the manner of the Ancients*. *Photius* speaks of no Extract of it; he only taketh notice, 'tis a long Discourse, containing nothing necessary, and nothing like the former. The 3d. Sermon is upon the Festival of the Meeting [of Christ and *Simon*] or the Presentation of *Jesus Christ* in the Temple. *Photius* sets down an Extract of it in which the Virtues of *Anna*, and the Virgin's Purification, are discours'd of Figuratively and Rhetorically.

GEORGE of Alexandria.

George. **I**t is thought, that *George*, the Author of *St. Chrysostome*'s Life, was the Bishop of *Alexandria*, who succeeded *John* the Alms-giver in the year 620, and held that See till 630. This Life is a great deal larger than that of

Palladius, but less faithful, and full of many Untruths. His Style, in the judgment of the Learned *Photius*, is very plain, and somewhat flat. He offends against the Laws of Grammar, and is not exact in the construing of Words.

George. It is needless to make the Extract of this Life, because what it contains more than is in *Palladius*, and the other ancient Historians, is either false or doubtful. He hath often misrepresented the matters of Fact, which he relates upon trust from other Authors. He alledges many of them contrary to the Testimonies of St. *Chrysostome*, and the Authors of his Time. He hath counterfeited many Letters, and falsely attributed them to the Emperors *Arcadius*, and *Honorius*, and Pope *Innocent*. He confidently asserts contrary to the Truth of History, That this Pope excommunicated the Emperor *Honorius* and Empress *Eudoxia*. He hath reported an infinite number of things evidently false. *Photius*, who

made a long Extract of this Life, confesses himself that he hath said many things contrary to the Truth of History; but he thinks, the Reader may pick out that which is true and useful, and pass by the rest. Methinks it were better and fitter to fetch things out of the Originals, than to mispend ones time to read them in those ill Copiers and Plagiaries. This Work was published in *Greek* by Sir *H. Savil*, in the last Volume of St. *Chrysostome's* Works, printed at *Eaton*; together with the Life of the same Father by other later Authors, who copied out this Man's Fictions, and added others to them, after the manner of the modern *Greeks*.

HONORIUS.

Honorius. Pope *Honorius*, whose Name became so famous by reason of his Condemnation in the 6th. Council, was raised to the Pontificate the 13th. of May, 626. and died October 11th. 628. Besides the two Letters he hath written to *Sergius* upon the Question of the two Wills in Christ, which will be spoken of in the Acts of the 5th. Council, where they are inserted, we have some others upon particular Matters. The 1st. is directed to the Exarch *Isaacs*, to whom he complains, that certain Bishops advised a Lord to forsake *Adalade*, the lawful King of the *Lombards*, to side with the Tyrant *Arioualde*; and he desires him, after having restor'd *Adalade*, to send those Bishops to *Rome* to him, that he may punish them for their Disloyalty. We learn of *Paul*, the Deacon, that *Adalade* was turn'd out by the *Lombards*, because he had lost his Senses, and that *Arioualde* was put in his room.

The Second Letter of *Honorius* is directed to the Bishops of the Provinces of *Venice* and *Istria*. He recommends to them *Primogenius* whom he had consecrated to be Arch-Bishop of *Gratz*, and prays them, to admit him into the place of him who had been deprived of that Church.

The three next Letters are concerning the Question of the two Wills in Christ.

The fifth and sixth are taken out of *Bedæ*; therein he congratulates *Edwin* King of *Northumberland* for his Conversion; he exhorts him to Perseverance in the Faith and Piety; he recommends St. *Gregory's* Works to him for his reading, and tells him, he sends two Palls to both the Metropolitans of his Kingdom.

The sixth ought to be directed to those two Metropolitans, named *Honorius* and *Paulinus*, the one Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, the other of *York*. He exhorts them to dis-

charge the Duties of their Ministry worthily, and grants to them, that when either of the Bishops of those two Sees shall happen to die, the Survivor may ordain another in his Room.

Honorius's two last Letters are taken out of the Collection of Canons of Cardinal *Deasledit*. In the first directed to the Bishops of *Epirus*, he tells them, that he sends them the Pall for *Hypatius*, whom they had ordained Bishop of *Nicopolis*; but because he had been suspected of having had a hand in his Predecessor *Soterius's* Death, his Will is, that when the time of Peace shall give him leave, he should come to *Rome* to clear himself by (i) Oath before St. *Peter's* Tomb, from having been any ways accessory to it; and he says, that *Soterius* had thus cleared himself from some Suspensions against him. The second is directed to *Sergius* Subdeacon, about a business concerning the Bishop of *Cagliari*. That Bishop was at variance with certain of his Clerks; the Parties had been cited to *Rome*; the Bishop had appeared there, and his Clerks being not come thither, the Pope had sent an Advocate from *Rome* to bring them; but the Governor of *Sardinia* detained them in *Africa*, to keep them out of the Pope's Jurisdiction, which obliged him to intreat *Sergius* to sue to the *Præfectus Prætorio* to do him Justice, by ordering that Governor to send those Clerks to *Rome*. He transmitted to him at the same time a Copy of *Valentinian* and *Theodosius's* Law to support his Pretension.

[(i) Oath before St. Peter's Tomb. This Action, tho' but a Ceremony in swearing, yet being intended as a piece of Divine Honour to St. *Peter*, was an idolatrous and sinful Custom which crept in with Saint-Worship.]

SOPHRONIUS.

Sophronius. *Sophronius*, of *Damascus*, elected Patriarch of *Jerusalem* in the Year 629, was one of the great Opposers of the *Monothelites*; when he was but a Monk he opposed that Error springing up at *Alexandria*, and did his Endeavours to hinder *Cyrus* from entertaining it. He was the first Patriarch that condemned it, and before he died, he sent a Bishop to *Rome* to demand the solemn Condemnation of it. *Photius* in the 231st. Volume of his *Bibliotheca* says, he had perused a Synodal Letter of that Patriarch, directed to *Honorius* then governing the Church of *Rome*, in which he did exactly explain and defend the Doctrine of the Church; that he observed there, that *Magnus* had been excommunicated, together with *Apollinarius*, and that *Theodore* had not been banished out of the Church, tho' he did not agree with St. *Cyril*; that he distinguished there two *Origen's*, the one Elder, the other surnamed *Adamantius*, altho' they be really the same; that he mentioned one *James* of *Syria* Author of the Sect of the *Acephali*; that he prayed *Honorius*, that, in case he had forgotten in his Letter some thing which he should have said, he would supply it, and amend what he should think amiss in it; That he cited the Testimonies of several Fathers, whereof *Photius* maketh the Catalogue, to confute those Mens Opinions, who pretended, there was but one Operation in Christ. This is the sum of that Letter, as it is reported by *Photius*.

This Patriarch of *Jerusalem* wrote also another Synodal Letter on the same Subject, directed to *Sergius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, mentioned in the 11th. Act of the 6th. Council. It contains a long Profession of Faith, in which, after a large Dissertation upon the Mystery of the Incarnation, and having encountered the Heresies and Errors opposite to the Faith of the Church, he concludes, that the two Natures in Jesus Christ have each their distinct Operations. He names and condemns an infinite number of Hereticks. He asserts, the Souls to be created when our Bodies are formed, and that we shall rise with the very same Bodies we have. He attributes the contrary Opinion to *Origen*, against whom he proves the Eternity of Pain.

Besides these Two Dogmatical Monuments, we have Four Sermons fathered upon *Sophronius*; the first is on our Saviour's Birth, wherein the Cruelties of the *Saracens*, who had invaded the Town of *Bethlehem*, are mentioned. The

Second is a Panegyrick of the Angels, full of Praises and Prayers, as also the other two (k) Sermons of the Praises of the Cross. *Photius* found out the true Style of that Author, when he observed that he used extraordinary Terms, and goes skipping along. By this Character it is plain enough, that it is another *Sophronius*, spoken of by the same *Photius* in the

[(k) Sermons of the Praises of the Cross. The Cross of Christ was at first a stumbling Block to the *Jews*, Foolishness to the *Gentiles* and a Reproach to the *Christians* themselves, who were in derision called the Disciples of a crucified God. To shew therefore their Constancy, and love to their Profession, they did frequently cross themselves on their Breasts and Foreheads, to testify their sincere Belief, that Jesus who was

crucified was their Saviour, and that they were not ashamed of his Cross. These were the only Crosses, (or Crossings rather) that were used by the Christians for 300 Years and more after Christ, for *Arnobius* says, *Crucis nec habemus, nec optamus*: We neither have Crosses nor desire any. But after it pleased God to promise *Constantine* the Great Victory over his Competitors in the Empire, by making the Sign of the Cross to appear to him *Euseb. de in the Air*, with this Inscription, *In hoc signo vinces*, which he *vir. Const.* therefore put immediately into the Imperial Standard to be lib. 1. adored by all the Soldiers according to the Custom, and was always Victorious with it, it ever after came to be in very great Esteem and Honour among the Christians. Wooden Crosses were made and placed in the Publick Markets, the Sign of the Cross was used in Celebrating the Sacraments, Honourable Titles were given to it by the Fathers, who called it, *Signum Fidei*, *Trophæum* *Dominicum*, *Signum Christi*, &c. *Dei*. At last, in this Superstitious and Idolatrous Age it was admitted into the Church together with the Images of Christ, and his Saints, excellent Praises bestowed upon it by this, and other Bishops, in their Sermons, who were zealous for Image-Worship, and became an object of Adoration together with them.]

Sophronius 5th. Volume of his *Bibliotheca*, in these Words. 'I have read a Book of *Sophronius*'s for St. Basil, against *Eunomius*; he is more learned and short than *Theodorus*; he does not keep close to all that *Eunomius* hath said, but undertakes to oppose and confute the principal Points of *Eunomius*'s Heresie, his Character is to be peremptory and decisive, his Style is free and plain, yet not tedious, although he be full of Logical Arguments.

There is a bad Piece, intituled St. Peter's and St. Paul's Journeys, tho' St. Peter's only be mentioned, attributed to *Sophronius* of Jerusalem, but 'tis a ridiculous Forgery, not worth mentioning.

We may more justly attribute to *Sophronius* of Jerusalem, St. Mary the Egyptian's Life, quoted in the 7th. Council,

[(1) St. J. Damascene's Book Art. 4. by St. John Damascene, in his (1) Book of Images.] This Writer, who

ges, and by *Nicephorus Callisti* l. 7. c. 3. In the 7th. Council are cited two Fragments of a Discourse of *Sophronius*'s upon St. Cyrus, and St. John, for the Images of Saints. A Book likewise called the *Spiritual Meadow*, [*Limnarium*, or *Pratum Spirituale*,] is attributed to him. He died in 636.

this under his Name, better becoming an Heathen than a Christian, for which Reason his Writings are of small Esteem with judicious and pious Men.] *Cas. adv. Bar. p. 83.*

is reckoned among the Fathers of the Church, and much quoted by *Romish* Authors in their Controversy with Protestants, was a credulous and superstitious Person, a great Patron of Images, and a zealous Defender of Image-Worship, and the other Errors which sprang up about his time. Inasmuch, that it is no wonder that we meet with Books of such Titles as

JOANNES MOSCHUS.

J. Moschus
[S named
ed *Ecclesiastical*
as]

THE Author of the *Spiritual Meadow*, is called *Joannes Moschus* *, Presbyter and Monk, who having run through the Monasteries of the East, came to Rome with his Scholar *Sophronius*, believed to be him, we have now spoken of, tho' without any certain proof. He gathered into that Book what he had learned of the Life, Actions, Sentences, and Miracles of the Monks of divers Countries. There he relates many strange Stories and Miracles that deserve little Credit. We shall not stand to relate them, but shall only remark what may be useful to clear the Church-Discipline. He observes in the third Chapter, there was a Presbyter who did baptize, and anoint the Baptized with the Holy Chrism; but that he would have left that Function, because that when he baptized Women, he felt some Motions troublesome to him. In the 25th. he says, that a Friar having pronounced the Words of Consecration upon some Loaves he had brought to offer upon the Altar, when the Priest offered them, he did not see the Holy Ghost coming down, as it used to do, and that he was warned by an Angel, that those Loaves had been consecrated before, because that Friar had pronounced in the way the Words of Consecration, and that this Priest forbade them afterwards to suffer any other to learn them, but such as were to offer the Holy Sacrifice, and that no Body should pronounce them, but in the time of the Consecration. In the 26th. he reports, that a Monk, to prove there was no Salvation to be had out of the Church, had shewed to one of his Brethren engaged in *Nestorius*'s Error, Hereticks in a place full of Fire and Filth. In the 27th. he says, A Priest would not say Mass, unless he saw the Holy Ghost descending upon the Altar, tho' the Hour of the Celebration of it ought always to be the same. In the 29th. he relates, that a Stylite Monk of the Communion of the Catholics, sent to another Stylite of the Sect of the *Severians*, for a share of his Communion Bread, and that having thrown it into boiling Water, it was presently dissolved, but that having afterwards thrown a Particle of the Eucharist of the Catholics into it, the Water cooled, and the Eucharist remained intire, without moistening it. In the 30th. he relates another (m) Miracle of the Eucharist, that a *Severian* having forced his Wife, a Catholic, to throw the Communion-Bread away, he did see it shining in the Mire, and that two Days after he had seen an *Assyrian*, saying to him, we are both condemned to the same Torment. In the 44th. he says, that a Friar who had been negligent during his Life, was after his Death seen by an Old Man in a great Fire up to the Neck, and telling the Old Man, he was beholden to his Prayers for the Favour he enjoyed, of not having his Head also in the Fire. In the 45th. he says, A Recluse promised the Devil, he would (n) adore the Virgin's Image no more, to be deliver'd from his Temptation, and that he was reproved by his Elder for doing so. In the 47th. he relates, that the Virgin having appeared twice to a Jester, uttering impious Speeches against her, and having warned him to do so no more, but to no purpose, she appeared to him the third time, and that having

signed his Hands and Feet with the Sign of the Cross, he found himself, when he awoke without Hands and Feet. In the 79th. he observeth, it was the Custom in *Constantinople*, to keep the Eucharist they received on *Holy Thursday*, to the *Holy Thursday* of the next Year; and that a Catholic being Servant to a *Severian*, having left with his Master the Key of his Chest where he had laid up the Eucharist in a Linen-Cloth, the Master having designed to burn it, because his Servant did not come back, found that the Particles of the Eucharist had brought forth Ears of Corn. He relates in Chapter 176th. that a young Jew finding himself in great Extremity in a Desert without Water, and having called for Baptism on those that accompanied him, one of them baptized him, by throwing Sand on his Head three times, and saying the usual Words, Such an one is baptized in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, that presently after that Jew found himself better; that afterwards it was debated, whether that Baptism was good and valid, and that at last he was sent to *Jordan* to be baptized there, and he that baptized him was ordained Deacon. In the 196th. he relates, that some Children of the Province of *Apamea*, would needs represent the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries, and that having chosen one of themselves to perform the Office of a Priest, and two others of Deacons, they set some Bread upon a Stone, and that he that acted the Priest did pronounce the Words of Oblation, which he had gotten by-heart, because it was the Custom of his Church, that Children should receive the Communion next after the Clerks, and being for that reason pretty near the Altar, they overheard the Words of the Holy Sacrifice, which the Priests in some places used to utter aloud, that having thus performed all the Ceremonies before they brake the Bread to give the Communion, Fire came down from Heaven which consumed the Oblation, and the whole Stone whereon it was laid; that the Bishop of the place hearing of it, built a Monastery in that place, and made all those Children Monks. To this Example he adds that reported by *Basilius*, of the Baptism administered by St. *Arbanasius*, who was then but a Child, to some other Children, and says, that St. *Arbanasius* believed, those that receive Baptism out of Fear, and without Faith, are nevertheless baptized, tho' Baptism does them no good. In the 207th. there is mention made of two Angels who stood Sureties for a Girl which had a mind to be baptized. In the 214th. It is observed, they baptized in the East on the Day of *Epiphany*, as well as on *Easter-day*, and *Whitsunday*.

Such things as these are in that Book, which may be of some use for the Church-Discipline. It is moreover full of an infinite Number of Relations, and miraculous strange Stories,

Preachers in their Sermons, and by Historians in their Legends. Many wholly feigned, others in part, or in shew only acted, till Superstition and Idolatry at last were fully established, and by these Delusions are still upheld in the Church of Rome. Indeed St. *Austine* says, that several Miracles were done in his time at the Martyrs Tombs, and by their Relicks, but as he sometimes scrupled the Truth of them, so he was willing to let them pass as such, because the Faith was confirmed by them, and there appeared no other end of them but to advance the same Worship that the Church professed. Had they been made a Foundation of Saint-Worship, as afterward they were, he would certainly have rejected them as forged, or wrought for a false end and intention, as it is commanded.] *Aug. de Civ. Dei, l. 22. c. 10. Deut. 13. v. 5.*

[(n) Adore the Virgin's Image.] Among the Images of Saints which were admitted into the Church in this Age, and became Objects of Divine Worship, the Image of the Virgin Mary, the Mother of God had a chief place. And tho' this Story were true, that the Devil did sometimes tempt a Monk to abjure the Worship of the Virgin's Image, which is really a Doctrine of Devils, yet the Artifice of Satan in this Temptation could be no other than this, to establish that Doctrine as Divine, which he had secretly first brought into practice, by endeavouring openly to extort it from the more zealous Practisers of it. And so make his diabolical Delusions pass for Sacred and Divine Truths.]

[(m) Miracle of the Eucharist, &c. It is really very strange to meet with so many Miracles in this Age in the Writers of it, Whereas in the three precedent Centuries we find little or no mention of any. Yea, St. *Chrysostome* says, *Nos Miraculis nequaquam indigemus quia nunc non habemus*, &c. As we have no Miracles, so we want none. The Faith having been sufficiently confirmed by Christ and his Apostles, Miracles afterwards became useless, and therefore ceased. But when the Church began to preach *Alterum Evangelium*, another Gospel, and such Doctrines were imposed and taught, as neither Christ nor his Apostles had ever wrought any one Miracle in Confirmation of, it was thought the readiest way to gain Credit to the Imposture, either to feign, or outwardly do some Miracles, which might extort Belief from the Vulgar. To this end did not only Men but Devils conspire together in working lying Wonders to confirm the Adoration of Images, the Sacrament, Saints Relicks, and the like. Strange things were done thro' the Artifices of Satan by the Martyrs Bones, stranger related by the

Gal. 1. 8.

Carus in
he. Theol.
l. 11. c. 6.

ries, of Apparitions, Revelations, Visions, and Miracles, wrought by those Hermits, whether by foretelling things to come, by discovering Mens Thoughts, healing the Sick, commanding Lions and wild Beasts, or working extraordinary Feats. Death it self did not hinder them from working Miracles, from the Grave they did speak to the Living, and wrought Miracles in their Behalf. Among those wonderful Stories, of little Credit for the most part, there be found inimitable Examples of Virtue, extraordinary Auster-

rities, excessive Fasts, wonderful Poverty, and such a Simplicity and Humility, as would sometimes pass for Sottishness; an immoderate Zeal against Hereticks, fierce Conflicts with Devils, and some witty and Holy Answers. The Style of that Work is low and coarse. It was translated into Latin by *Ambrosius Camaldulensis*, and printed in Greek in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* 1624. *Cotelerius* published at last the Greek of some Chapters, which were before wanting, in his second Volume of *Ecclesiastical Monuments*.

GEORGIUS, surnamed PISIDES.

Georgius. **G**eorgius, Deacon and Library-Keeper of the Church of *Constantinople*, surnamed *Pisides*, wrote a Book in Iambick Verse upon the Creation of the World, which the Ancients call * the Six Days Work. He wrote also the Life of the Emperor *Heraclius*, the *Persian* War, a Panegyrick upon the Martyr *Anastasius*, and another Work intituled *Abarica*, [or *Avarica*, being an History of the *Avars*.]

We have the first Work of this Author, which is dedicated to *Sergius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and another Poem of the Vanity of this Life, together with some Fragments taken out of *Snidas*. He is a better Poet than Divine.

This is probably the same *Georgius*, who made some Sermons in the praise of the Virgin, published by *F. Combes*, whereof some are upon the Virgin's Conception, and his Mother's; others upon the Virgin's Birth, her Presentation in the Temple, her assisting at the Cross, and at the Sepulchre; they are full of Fables, (taken out of the Apocryphal Book of the Virgin's Birth, falsely fathered upon *St. James*,) and of extraordinary Commendations of the Virgin, and her Parents. They are Declamations full of Descriptions, Exclamations, rhetorical Figures, and emphatical Terms, but void of Sense and Reason, and fitter for Sport than Instruction. The last of these Sermons is upon *St. Cosmus* and *St. Damian*.

EUGENIUS Bishop of Toledo.

Eugenius. **E**ugenius having lived in Solitude, and in the Practice of the Monastical Life, near the City of *Saragosa*, was forced to be Bishop of *Toledo*, by order from the Prince. *Ildephonsus*, who succeeded him in that See, tells us, he wrote a Book of the Trinity, and two little Books, whereof the one was in Verse of divers Measures, the other in Prose; that he had also revised *Dracontius's* Work on the Creation of the World, and had made it a great deal better than it was, and had added to it the Work of the seventh Day.

Sirmondus hath published *Eugenius's* Poems, containing

several Pieces on different Subjects. The Style of them is not very polite, but the Fancies are very exact and judicious, and he is full of very Christian Sentiments. Cardinal *Aguirre*, in his *Notitia* of the Councils of *Spain*, promises a Letter of this *Eugenius* to *Protasius*, and a new Book of Epigrams that has never been published.

He had a Predecessor named *Eugenius*, whom *Ildephonsus* ranks also among the Ecclesiastical Writers; but he speaks of none of his Works in particular; nay, he does not say he had written any: Wherefore we shall say nothing of his Life.

APOLLONIUS, Presbyter of Novara.

Apollonius. **T**his Presbyter hath composed a Poem of the Destruction and Ruin of *Jerusalem* by *Vespasian*. His Expressions are noble, his Terms poetical, and his Verses have a very sweet Cadence. This Work is

divided into four Books; he is one of the best Christian Poets we have: He makes no difficulty of calling upon the Muses, and to use the Names of Prophane Gods.

JOHN IV.

John IV. **T**his Pope did not enjoy the *Roman* See long; for he was raised to it in 640, and died in 641. *Anastasius* hath preserved in his Collections an Apology which he made for his Predecessor *Honorius*, in which he pretends, that that Pope was not in the Error of the *Monothelites*, who acknowledged but one Will in Jesus Christ; and that when he said, there were not two Wills in Christ, he understood it of two contrary Wills, or of the inferior and superior Part, that is, of Concupiscence which is contrary to the rational Will; but he never meant, that there was but one Will only in Christ, consisting of the Divine and the Humane Will united into one.

We have yet two Letters of this Pope; the first is writ-

ten to the *Irish* Abbots in the Name of *Hilarius*, Arch-Priest of the Church of *Rome*, holding the See, during the Vacancy, in the Place of *John*, who was elected, but not consecrated yet, and of two other Officers of the *Roman* Church, the one having the Title of Secretary of State, the other of Counsellor. They reprove them for not keeping *Easter* at the same time with other Churches, and for retaining some Relicks of *Pelagianism* among them.

The second Letter is to *Isaac* of *Syracuse*. He declares therein, that Monks ought to be permitted to chuse, and put into the Churches given them, such Priests as they will, yet with this *Proviso*, that if they do any thing against the Bishop they shall be punish'd by the Synod.

THEODORUS I.

Theodor. I. **A**fter *John IV's* Death, *Theodorus* was chosen in his Room, in *November*, the Year 641. He wrote two Letters, and a Memoir, against *Pyrrhus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who had been deprived, and *Paul* put in his room. 'Tis to this last, *Theodorus's* first Letter is directed. He sends him word, that *Pyrrhus* ought to be condemned and deposed in a Synod, for commending *Heraclius*, and going about to make a new Profession of Faith. He tells him, that in case he could not get him condemned in his Country, he must only pray the Emperor to cause him to be brought to *Rome*, and that he will get him judged in a Council. The second Letter is directed to the

Bishops who had ordained *Paul*. He finds fault with them for ordaining him before they had deposed *Pyrrhus*, and for giving him the Title of Most Holy. He takes notice of the Reasons why he should be condemned; 1. Because he had commended *Heraclius*; and, 2. Because he had made a new Profession of Faith, contrary to the Apostolick Doctrine, against the Prohibition of the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*. In the Memoir he exhorts the *Eastern* Bishops, to preserve the ancient Faith of the Church, and to reject the Novelties brought in by *Pyrrhus*, and his Confession of Faith.

MARTIN I.

Martin I. being ordained Bishop of Rome, in July 649. held in October following, a Council of 105. Bishops against the *Monothelites*; in which he condemned *Sergius* and *Pyrrhus*, who had been formerly Bishops of *Constantinople*, and *Paul*, then in possession of it. At that time the Emperor *Constans* sent the Exarch *Olympius* into Italy, with an order to force the Bishops of Italy to receive the * Type published by him. *Olympius* found the Pope, the Bishops and the Clergy of Italy in a very contrary Disposition, and was forced to enter into Agreement with *Martin*; but this Exarch being dead, a while after, in Sicily, where he had the Command of an Army against the *Saracens*, the Emperor sent *Theodorus*, first named *Calliopas*; who caused Pope *Martin* to be taken away by Force, in July 653. He remained a whole year in the Isle of *Naxos*, and came not to *Constantinople* till towards the end of 654. from whence he was banished into *Chersona*, where he died, in 656. in June.

We have seventeen Letters of his.

The first is a circular Letter to all Bishops, to let them know, he had condemned the Error of the *Monothelites*.

The second is directed to *Amandus* Bishop of *Utrecht*, who had written to him, that he was so much grieved to see the Disorder of certain Clergymen, who committed the Sin of the Flesh after their Ordination, that he had a mind to leave his Bishoprick, to live in Peace and Quietness. He dissuades him from that Design, and advises him to deal with those Sinners with all the Severity that the Canons allow; declaring, that all those that are fallen, after their Ordination, shall remain suspended for ever, and be forever disabled from performing any Sacerdotal Function: That they shall pass their whole Life in Penance, for the Expiation of their Fault: For, saith he, if we chuse Persons of an innocent Life, to be promoted to Orders, with how much greater Reason should we hinder those who are fallen after their Ordination, from meddling with the Holy Mysteries with defiled Hands, and polluted with Crimes? Let them therefore be deposed for ever, according to the Decrees of the Councils; to the end that the Searcher of Hearts, who will not suffer any of his Sheep to perish, seeing the Sincerity of their Repentance, may forgive them at the Day of Judgment. Then he exhorts that Bishop to undergo any manner of Pains, Torments and Toil for the Salvation of his Sheep, and the Service of God. Lastly, he gives him notice, that he hath condemned the *Monothelites*, in a General Council of his Brethren, and sends him the Acts themselves, to the end he may publish them, and cause them to be received in his Country. He prays him to persuade King *Sigebert* to send some Bishops to the Holy See, that they may carry home the Acts of that Council, and joyn with him in the Defence of the Faith.

The third is directed to the Emperor *Constans*, in the Name of the whole Synod. He acquaints him, that he hath condemned the Error of the *Monothelites*, in a Synod, of which he sends him the Acts.

The fourth is to the Bishop of *Carthage*, and to all the Bishops of *Africa*. He approves the Confession of Faith they had sent him, and sends them the Acts of the Council.

In the fifth he makes *John* Bishop of *Philadelphia*, to whom he writes, his Vicar in all the East, giving him Power to make Bishops and Priests in the Churches of the Patriarchates of *Jerusalem* and *Antioch*, to receive those that will renounce their Error, and to confirm them in their Churches, provided there be no other canonical Impediment: For, saith he, we ought to be the Defenders, and not Betrayers of the Canons. Thus he will not have him to confirm them, who have chosen themselves, nor those whose Election was not canonical. He mentions particularly the Election of *Macedonius* Bishop of *Antioch*, who was made Bishop in a strange Country, without the Consent of the People, and without a Decree of Election, as well as that of *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*. He will have them that shall be admitted, not only to abjure the Error of the *Monothelites*, but moreover to condemn *Theodorus*, *Cyrus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul*, and all of the same Opinion with them; to reject the Type, and to make a clear Profession, that they believe two Wills in Christ. He appoints two Bishops, named *Theodorus* and *Anthony*, with an Abbot, to help him in that Function; to whom he directs the three next Letters, to exhort them to joyn themselves with that Bishop, for the Defence of the Faith. In the last, he speaks of *Stephen*, an *Eastern* Bishop, whom he had also made his Vicar. He explains that matter in the next Letter, directed to *Panzaleo*, in which he complains, that they had accused that Bishop, and hindered him from receiving the Letter which he had sent him, to ordain Priests and Bishops. He repeats also here, that those Bishops ought not to be confirmed, who have been elected in another Town, than that whereof they are Priests or Bishops, and without the Consent of the Bishop or the Metropolitan; thus he declares void all the Ordinations made in *Sophronius*'s Patriarchate, which had not been done by his Authority.

VOL. II.

In the tenth, he recommends his Vicar to a great Lord, named *Peter*.

In the eleventh, to the Church of *Jerusalem*, he acquaints them with the Condemnation of the Error of the *Monothelites*, and declares void the Ordinations of *Macedonius*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, and *Peter* Bishop of *Alexandria*.

In the twelfth, he declares to *Paul* of *Thessalonica*, that he hath excommunicated and deposed him for his Errors.

In the thirteenth, he acquaints the Church of *Thessalonica* with *Paul*'s Condemnation, and exhorts them to avoid his Heresy.

In the fourteenth, to *Theodorus*, he relates what passed, when he was violently taken away from Rome. He says, that he coming out of the *Constantinian* Church, encompassed with Guards, they said in the Presence of the Exarch, *Anathema* to him that believes that *Martin* did change or will change the least Word in the Faith: *Anathema* to them that shall not persevere in the orthodox Faith unto Death. That *Calliopas* hearing this, said, he had no other Faith; that he answered him, He would defend that Faith unto Death; and as for the other things charged on him, he was altogether innocent of them; that he had never written to the *Saracens*; that he sent them no Money neither, only that he had given some Alms to some Servants of God coming to Rome; that it was false that he had uttered any thing against the Respect due to the Virgin, and that he pronounced *Anathema* to whoever did not reverence and adore her. These are the Terms used by him, *non honorat atque adorat*; but the Term of *Adoring* is not to be taken strictly, for in the next Letter they make *Calliopas* say, he was come to adore the Pope, that is, to pay his Respects to him.

He relates yet the same Story more at large in the fifteenth Letter, directed to the same *Theodorus*, where he says, that foreseeing what was to come, he had withdrawn himself and all his Clergy into the *Constantinian* Church, thus named, because it was the first that *Constantine* had built, near the Bishop's Palace; that he was there the *Saturday*, 13th, of June, in the year 653. when *Calliopas* came to Rome with an Army; that he sent some of his Clergy to meet him; that *Calliopas* told them, that he was come to adore the Pope, that is, to pay him his Respects; that notwithstanding, the next Day being *Sunday*, he sent Word, that he was too much tired to come to him; that on *Monday* he sent Word to the Pope by his Secretary, he ought not to call Men together, nor prepare Arms and Stones to defend himself; that *Martin* shewed to them he had sent, that this was false; that he lay sick ever since *October*, and had set his Bed before the Altar; that about Noon a Multitude of armed Men entred into the Church with a great deal of Tumult, and that they broke at their entring, all the (o) Tapers in the Church.

Then *Calliopas* shewed an Order from the Emperor, declaring, that *Martin* was to be turned out of the Holy See, and to be sent to *Constantinople*, and another Bishop be put in his room. Which, says he, was never done; for in the Bishop of Rome's Absence, the Arch-deacon, the Arch-priest, and the principal Secretary do occupy his Place. *Martin*, unwilling that any body should be killed for him, yielded himself presently to them, and begged only some of his Clerks to accompany him. *Calliopas* finding no Resistance, bade *Martin* come along with them to his Palace, which he obey'd; all his Clergy came to him the next day, and many were ready to go along with him; but that same Night, he was violently carried away, without suffering any body to accompany him, but six Men-Servants and a Cook: From thence he was carried away to the Isle of *Naxos*, where he staid one year, at the end of which he was brought to *Constantinople*. This is the Abridgment of what is contained in that Letter.

[(o) Tapers in the Church.]

As several other Heathen and Jewish Ceremonies were received by the Christians in compliance with the Jews and Gentiles, that their conversion might be the more easy: So this of burning of Tapers in their religious Assemblies. At first, they were indeed lighted only at the Vigils, to which not Religion but Necessity obliged them; but afterward, in *Jerome*'s time, they were lighted up upon the Tombs of the Martyrs, in honour to them, and in the *Eastern* Church, were always lighted up at the Reading of the Gospel, and in some Places at the Interpreting of it, and that at *Balsus* Noon-day. At last it was imposed by *Gregory* the Great, and confirmed by *Sabinian*, anno 606. Many of the Fathers inveighed fiercely against this Custom, in the *Massilians* or *Euchite*, *Cur diem Lucernis infringimus*, says *Tertullian*, *Quis Lucernas vnas proferre compellit?* And so *Lactantius*, *Num mentis compos putandus est: qui datori luminis Candelarum tamen offert pro munere?* But Superstition prevailing in the Church, brought in this with other Ceremonies, which, if the most noxious, had been more tolerable.]

Hieron. de Vigilant.
Cent. I. Script. Brit.
Tertul. in Apolog. Lact. Inst. l. 6. c. 2.

The Particulars of his Usage in *Constantinople* are related in a Letter or Memoir, written under the name of a good Christian to the Bishops of the West. He says, that *Martin*, being

being come up to that Haven, nigh the Church of St. *Enphemia*, the 17th of December, he was left all the Day long in the Ship; that towards the Evening they took him into a Boat, and carried him to the Prison of the Court of Guard; wherein he was shut up fourscore and thirteen Days, no body being suffered to speak to him; that after that space of time, he was brought into the Council-Chamber of the Emperor, where the Accusers and Witnesses, prepared against him, were ordered to appear; they were Soldiers or armed Men, who accused him of conspiring with *Olympius*. *Martin* refused and excepted against the Witnesses they brought against him, and maintained, he was more innocent by far than those Witnesses themselves, and all the rest that sided with *Olympius*; that he came to *Rome* in quality of Exarch, that he had the Authority and Power in his Hands, and that they were forced to obey him. After this tumultuary Information, they carried him to a Terrace, where they stripped him, and loaded him with Chains, dragged him thro' the Town, and put him in the Prison of the *Prætorium*, laden with the Burden of his Chains, and brought to the last Extremity. The next day, the Emperor coming to visit *Paul* of *Constantinople*, who was ready to die, and acquainting him with what was done, that Bishop touched with a Remorse of Conscience, fetched a deep Sigh and turning him aside, said, Alas! 'tis to add to the Account I am to give to God. The Emperor asking him, why he did so? Is it not great pity, answered he, Bishops should be thus abused? And he earnestly besought the Em-

peror to suffer it no longer. After *Paul's* Death, *Pyrrhus* sought to be restored; but many opposed it, because of the Retraction he had made at *Rome*. They sent to Pope *Martin*, to ask him about the Passages of that Affair; he answered, that *Pyrrhus* came voluntarily to *Rome*; that his Predecessor *Theodorus* made him welcome; that he was entertained at the Cost of the *Roman* Church, the Custom whereof was, to find with Victuals all the Strangers who fled thither. They would have forced him to say, that *Pyrrhus* had signed his Retraction by Force; but he declared, he would always speak the Truth. After having staid 85 days in that Prison, they fetched him out of it, to banish him to *Chersona*, where he died the 16th. of September, in the year 656, having suffered much. He wrote two Letters from that place of his Exile, which are the two last, in which he represents his Wants, and the Poverty he suffered in that Country. He prays his Friends to send him some Relief from *Rome*: For, saith he, if St. *Peter* feed so many Pilgrims at *Rome*, it is very meet he should assist us, who are his Ministers, and suffer so much for the Truth and Religion.

This Pope's Constancy and Firmness appears in his Letters. They are well written, with Strength and Wisdom; the Style of them is great and noble, and worthy of the Majesty of the Holy See. The third, and the ten next, are found in *Greek* and *Latin*; either he wrote them himself in those two Languages, or they have been translated by some Body of that time.

St. MAXIMUS.

St. Maximus.

Maximus, descended of a noble Family of *Constantinople*, having been a while chief Secretary of State to the Emperor *Heraclius*, withdrew himself into the Monastery of *Chrysopolis*, of which he was Abbot. The Fear of the Barbarians Incursions, and the Errors spreading at *Constantinople*, forced him to fly into *Africa*, after *Heraclius's* Death, in the Year 641, of the Vulgar Æra. There he stoutly opposed the Error of the *Monothelites*, and prevail'd with the *Africans*, to joyn themselves with *John* Bishop of *Rome*, to condemn their Opinions. It fell out, that *Pyrrhus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and Head of that Party, who was banished out of *Constantinople*, because he was accused of having poisoned the Emperor *Constantine*, fled into *Africa*, where he met with *Maximus*, with whom he fell into Discourse, and yielded or feigned to yield to his Reasons; and hoping to be restored by the Pope's Help, he resolved to go to *Rome* with *Maximus*. Being arrived there, he presented an Orthodox Confession of Faith to Pope *Theodorus*. But hearing afterwards from the Exarch of *Ravenna*, that the Court was of the Party of the *Monothelites*, and that he could not be restored, unless he altered his Mind, he retracted his Opinions, and embraced again his first Tenents; which forced Pope *Theodorus* to condemn him in a Council, in which his Condemnation was signed with Ink, mixed with some of our Lord's Blood.

Maximus was the Man that did thus stir up the *Romans* against the *Monothelites*, and there is no doubt but he had a good share in the Council Pope *Martin* held at *Rome* against them; and therefore the Emperor *Constantine's* Anger did equally break out against him and Pope *Martin*. They were brought to *Constantinople*: *Maximus* appeared often before the Judges, and was condemned to Banishment in the year 655. He was sent into a small Town of *Thrace*, named *Byzias*, whither *Theodorus*, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, went to see him, to oblige him to yield to their Opinion; but when he could not prevail with him, they brought him back to *Constantinople*; and by a strange Cruelty, after he had suffered much, they cut off the Hand and Tongue of him, and his Disciple *Anastasius*; then he was sent into Prison in a Castle, called *Schemre*, where he died, Aug. 13. 662.

This Father wrote a great many Works. Some of them have been published in divers Collections; but *Combefis* hath published a good number of them in *Greek* and *Latin* in two Volumes, printed at *Paris*, 1675. At the beginning of these two Volumes is found St. *Maximus's* Life; written by a *Greek*, younger than he, but pretty well acquainted with the Affairs of his time, and the authentick Acts of this holy Man's Persecutions.

The first part of those Acts contains the verbal Process of what passed at *Constantinople* in the Emperor's Council, when *Maximus* was brought thither from *Italy*. In the first Interrogatory we find the Depositions of Witnesses accusing him of injurious Speeches to the Emperors. He defends himself against them, and maintains against the 4th. Witness, that he was in the right, when he said, that the Emperors, tho' Christians, were not Prelates. 'For, saith he, he who does not offer upon the Altars, does not baptize, does not give the Sacred Unction, does not lay on Hands, does not create Bishops, Priests and Deacons, does not consecrate Altars, does not wear the Sacerdotal Marks nor Habits, cannot be called a Prelate among Christians;

therefore, in the Oblation at the Altar, the Emperor is named after the Bishops, the Priests, the Deacons, and St. Maximus. the Clerks, in the Rank of the Laity.' Then they brought in his Disciple, who was accused of being an *Origenist*; but he purged himself from that Charge, by saying, *Anathema* to *Origen*. The same day, towards Evening, two of the Emperor's Officers, examined *Maximus* about the Conference he had with *Pyrrhus* in *Africa*. He related to them what was said in that Conference, and declared to them, he would not communicate with the Church of *Constantinople*, nor receive the * *Ecthesis* nor the *Type*; and though they urged him to communicate with the Bishop of *Constantinople*, he said, he would not. He was brought again composed the Saturday following to the Palace of *Constantinople*, and by *Sergius*, declared anew, that he did anathematize the *Type*, and would not communicate with the Church of *Constantinople* out by *Heraclius* as a years old, and his Disciple 37. Next after these first Acts, there be two Letters, the one *Greek* and *Latin*, written by *Maximus* to his Disciple; the other *Latin*, which is *Anastasius's* to the Monks of *Cagliari*. St. *Maximus* relates, in the first, that they would have forced him to say, that there are two Operations in Christ, but that they make but one, because of the Union, which he would not do. In the second, *Anastasius* does also reject that Opinion, and protests against the Violence used against them. The second part of the Acts contains the Conference which *Theodosius*, Bishop of *Cæsarea*, had with *Maximus*, at *Byzias*, in the Presence of the Emperor's Commissioners; in which *Maximus* declares to him that he could not communicate with the Church of *Constantinople*, in regard, she received the Novelties of the *Monothelites*; *Theodosius* promised him, that if he would communicate with the Bishop of *Constantinople*, they would reject the *Type*. He maintained, that that was not enough, and that they ought first to receive the Condemnation made by the Synod of *Rome*, held under *Martin*. *Theodosius* reply'd, that that Council was not valid, as having been assembled without the Emperors's Order. *Maximus* answered, there were many Synods assembled by the Emperor's Orders, which he did not receive; as those held by *Constantius* against the Faith of the *Nicene* Council, and that they did receive that which had deposed *Paulus Samosatenus*, notwithstanding it was held without the Emperor's Order; that it was ordered by the *Nicene* Council, that every year, two Councils should be held in the Provinces, without speaking of the Emperor's Orders; and lastly, that which moved them to approve and receive Councils, was the Truth of the Doctrine they established. This brought the Dispute to the Doctrine of the one Operation only. *Theodosius* undertook to prove it by supposititious Passages of Pope *Julius*, of St. *Athanasius*, and of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*; but *Maximus* having answered him, they were *Apollinaris's*; he produced two more, under St. *Chrysostome's* Name, which *Maximus* maintained to be *Nestorius's*, and proved it immediately. Then he explained a Passage of St. *Cyril*, after which it came again to be disputed whether they should say, One or Two Operations; and at last *Theodosius* said, he was ready to sign, that there were two Natures, two Wills, and two Operations in Christ. *Maximus* reply'd, it did not belong to him, who was but a Monk, to exact Professions of Faith from Bishops; but that if they were really of that Mind, they might write about it to the

the Bishop of Rome; and that tho' they were agreed in the St. Maximus. Doctrine, he could not communicate with them, till they had blotted out of * the Sacred Tables, which they recited at the Altar, the Names of those who had been anathematized in the Council of Rome; notwithstanding that he did advise them, that the Emperor should send an Address to the Bishop of Rome, and the Patriarch a Synodical Decree, agreeable to the Orthodox Doctrine. Theodosius promised him, that it should be done; yea, and engaged him, in case he were sent thither, to go along with him. Being agreed about that, they went to Prayers, and (p) kissed the holy Gospels, the Cross, and the Virgin's Image, and touched them, to confirm their mutual Promises. After that, having discoursed about some Points of Morality, Theodosius ask'd Maximus, whether they could not say, in a good Sense, that there was but one only Will in Christ, by reason of the Union of the two Wills? Maximus affirmed, that they could not. Theodosius, and they that were present, seemed to approve his Sentiment, and the Reasons he gave for it. Having parted good Friends in appearance, the Emperor Constant sent an Order to the Proconsul, Paul, to remove the Abbot Maximus from Byzias, and to bring him to the Monastery of St. Theodorus, near Rhegium. The next day Theodosius came to him, accompanied with two Noblemen, Epiphanius and Troilus. This last asked him, whether he would do what the Emperor should command him? He answered, he would obey his Orders, in all things concerning secular Affairs; but when they told him, it was the Emperor's Will, that he should approve the Type, and if he did do it, they would lead him to the great Church of Constantinople, and receive the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ with him, and own him for their Father. He complained to Theodosius, that they did not make good what they had promised. Theodosius answering, that the Emperor was against it; Maximus declared, that the very invisible Powers could not force him to do what they required of him. This Answer provoked the Fury of the Company against him, so that they abused him. But at last, Theodosius having appeased the Tumult, Epiphanius asked Maximus, why he dealt with his Prince and Church as Hereticks, seeing, they owned two Wills, and two Operations in Christ? Maximus replied, that, if it was so, they should not urge him to sign the Type. Epiphanius answered, that that was done by a kind of Condescension. Maximus maintained stoutly, that they ought to declare aloud and firmly, the Orthodox Faith. Epiphanius asked him, whether he had subscribed a Profession of Faith against them? He said, he had. Hereupon Epiphanius threatened him, which he did not seem to matter much. The next day, the Consul Theodosius delivered him into the Hands of the Soldiers, which brought him to Salembria, and then to Perbera, till at last he was condemned to have his Tongue cut out. Combefis hath added to these Acts, some Pieces collected by Anastasius, relating to the Life and Actions of St. Maximus, an Invektive made by a certain Monk against the Cruelty used against him, and some Extracts of St. Maximus's Offices, taken out of the Books of the Greek Church.

The first of St. Maximus's Works is intituled, Questions upon the Holy Scripture, dedicated to Thalassius Presbyter and Abbot. He shews, in the Preface of his Work, that Evil is not an Entity, nor a real Quality, but a Defect of the Creature, whereby it swerveth from its ultimate end, that is, from God; from whence he concludes, that all Evil comes from the Want of the Knowledge and Love of God, because the only means of Salvation, is to know him, to love and serve him, renouncing the Love of the Creatures, the Passions, the Lusts, and the vain Pleasures of this World. This Work contains Answers to 65 Questions. The 1st. is about the Nature and Use of Passions; the rest about some places of the Scripture. We must not look there for literal Explications of the Difficulties that might occur about those places of the Scripture; they are allegorical Explications and mystical Observations upon places of the Scripture, or Questions of Divinity, which he takes an occasion to handle from those places. He made himself some Scholia or Glosses upon his own Work, where he explains some Terms used, and establisheth or clearerth some Rules and Principles propounded by himself.

Photius did rightly observe, that this Work is very obscure and tedious to read; that he does so often wander from the Letter and the History, that one cannot keep pace with him; and those only who love Allegories and mystical Speculations, do relish him, and take Pleasure in the reading of him.

The 79 Answers to some other Questions, are shorter, and less obscure than the former, but they are not less stuffed with Explications not at all pertinent to the Letter of the Scripture, and with mystical and moral Thoughts.

He follows the same Method in the Exposition of the 59th Psalm, as well as in that of the Lord's Prayer, where he loseth himself in his mystical Speculations.

The Ascetic Discourse is more plain, 'tis a Dialogue between a Monk and an Abbot, in which the Abbot does instruct the simple Monk in the principal Rules of a spiritual Life. He shews him, that the Love of God, and the Renouncing of the Creatures, are the Foundation of it; that the Love of our Neighbour is the Effect of the Love of God; that Jesus Christ gave us a perfect Example of that Love; that we ought continually to fight against the Temptations of the Flesh and the Devil, mortify our Passions, resist the Motions of Lust, reject idle or impure Thoughts, be constant in Prayer, and have always the Fear of God before our Eyes. He complains, that the greatest part of Monks lived disorderly, and that their seeming Virtue was but Hypocrisy. He maketh an excellent Prayer to God for their Conversion. And adds, we ought to trust in his Goodness and Mercy, hoping for Salvation from him, which we cannot obtain by our selves. Photius speaking of this Work, says, it is useful for all Men, and chiefly for them that lead an Ascetic Life, because there he lays down the means how to become a Citizen of Heaven, by teaching Charitableness, and Works of Piety. It must also be confessed, that this Treatise is of the Ascetic Books the most useful, not only for Monks, but all Christians likewise, because it does very well explain the Principles and Fundamentals of the spiritual Life.

Maximus added to this Work 400 Spiritual Maxims, which he intituled, Of Charity, because there are many of them about Charity towards God and our Neighbour, in which that Holy Man places the whole spiritual Life, as being perswaded, all other Virtues and Duties are but Branches and Parts of it. There be sundry of those Maxims containing Precepts and Rules touching the Actions of Life, and those are the most useful; but some of the other contain nothing but spiritual and mystical Thoughts. Photius takes notice, that the Style of these two Works is clearer and more elaborate than any of the rest, and that they cannot be found fault with, unless it be because he did not always make use of the purest Terms.

The two hundred Theological and Oeconomical Maxims, contain not only Principles of Divinity, but also Maxims of Morality, and they would deserve, says Photius, to be compared with the four hundred Maxims above mentioned, if the great number of Allegories that they are filled with, did not render them more like the Questions to Thalassius. To these Chapters is annexed a Writing to Theopemptus, upon three Texts of the Gospel, entirely agreeing with the Answers to Thalassius.

Lastly, that Volume ends with 243 Moral Maxims, taken out of a Manuscript of the Vatican, where they are found under Maximus's Name. They are indeed like enough to the 400 Moral Maxims for Style and Matter.

The Fragment drawn out of a Book, intituled, A Resolution of sixty three Doubts, dedicated to the King of Achrida, now L'Ochrida, by St. Maximus, seems doubtful; because in Maximus's time there was no King at Achrida; which maketh it credible, 'tis the Work of some later Grecian, who wrote that Work when there were Kings in Bulgaria.

The second Volume of St. Maximus's Works comprehends his Theological and Polemical Tracts, with his Letters. The 25 first Tracts are divers Writings, or Answers, all tending to the same End, to shew that there be two perfect Natures, two Wills, and two Operations in Jesus Christ; in them he handles that Matter scholastically and acutely. Among those Tracts there is one, in which he defends that which he had said, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son.

The Conference with Pyrrhus is clearer, less cumber'd with scholastical Terms and Reasonings. Therein he relates what was said between them on both Sides. The Issue was, that Pyrrhus perswaded by his Reasons, that we ought to acknowledge two Wills, and two Operations in Christ, went to Rome with him and retracted his Error.

The Treatise of the Soul is upon another Subject. Therein he treats of many Questions touching the Nature of the Soul; he asserts it to be a spiritual Substance, distinct from the Body, simple, immortal, and intelligent. These Points are handled therein in a very dry manner, as a Logician rather than Divine.

Maximus's Letters are upon divers Subjects. The five first are upon moral Points. Therein he does chiefly recommend the Love of God, and of our Neighbour; the renouncing secular Desires, Alms-giving, Retiredness, and Repentance.

In the 6th. he shews the Soul to be spiritual; and in the 7th, that after Death it keeps its Intellectual and other Faculties.

The three next contain some Allegorical and Moral Observations.

In the 11th. He exhorts a Superior to deal Charitably with a Nun, which having left the Nunnery, had returned thither to do Penance.

The 12th. is a Writing against *Severus*, in which he establishes the distinction of the Two Natures in Christ. He complains in the beginning, that the Emperors had written some Letters into *Africa* favouring the *Severians*. He enquireth into the bottom of the Question of the two Natures in this Writing. He explains a passage in *St. Cyril*, and refutes *Severus's* Error, That the two Natures became one in Christ. The same Subject is also handled in the next Writing directed to a Lord, named *Peter*.

The 13th. Letter, which is the 41st piece of this Volume, is also on the Mystery of the Incarnation; but in the end of it he speaks of the Incursions of the *Arabians*, which spoiled the Frontiers of the Empire.

The 15th. is a Scholastical Tract of the Union and Distinction of the two Natures in Christ, directed to *Conon*, a Deacon of *Alexandria*. To it is joined a Letter directed to the same Deacon, to exhort him to stand up in the defence of the Truth, without being dismayed at the sufferings attending the defence of it.

The 17th. is directed to *Julian*. It is also about the distinction of the two Natures.

The 18th. is written in the Name of *George*, a Noble Man of *Africa*, to some Nuns of *Alexandria*, engaged in the Error of the *Monotheletes*, to dissuade them from it.

The 19th. is written to *Pyrrhus*, before he was Patriarch, and had declared himself openly against the Church. *Maximus* asks him, How his Saying is to be understood, that there was but one Vertue or Operation in Christ.

The following Letters, to divers private Persons, are shorter than the former, and contain nothing but some Moral or Mystical Discourses.

The Five Dialogues upon the Trinity, which were published under *Anastasius's* Name, are here restored to *St. Maximus*, upon the Authority of the *Greek* Manuscripts and Authors, which have quoted them under this Father's Name. We have shewed already, that *Combesis* was in the right, to put them under *Maximus's* Name, and that they are none of *Theodoret's*, as *F. Garner* pretended. After so many Writings of the Ancients upon the Trinity, there is no need to make an Extract of this, where that Mystery is handled after *Maximus's* Genius Scholastically, and in the form of a Conference.

*Maximus's * Mystagogy*, are Considerations of the Church-Ceremonies. He says there, that the Church is the Figure and Image of God, the World, Man, and the Soul. That the *Introitus* of the Mass, is a representation of Christ's entrance into our Souls. That the Lessons signify the Faith of Christians. That the Songs are Signs of the Spiritual Joy. That the Gospel figures the Consummation of the World, and the Perfection of Christians. That when the Bishop de-

scends from his Chair, he represents Christ descending from Heaven in the Day of Judgment. That the going out of *St. Maximus's* *Catechumens* teaches us, that those that have not Faith shall be rejected. That the Doors shut, the Kiss of Peace, and the saying of the Creed, are the Figures of the perfect Union of Christians. That the *Trisagion* and the *Sanctus* are Types of our future Glory, and present Adoption: This whole Book is full of such Allegories.

Lastly, The last of *Maximus's* Works, is a Collection of sundry passages of Ecclesiastical and Prophane Authors, set down under different Titles, concerning Virtues, Vices, Womens Duties, Moral Precepts, and Maxims.

We have moreover a Comment, or *Scholia* of *Maximus* upon the Books ascribed to the *Areopagite*, which is printed with *Dionysius's* Works. He writ also some *Scholia* upon *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, which were printed at *Oxford* in 1681. *Petavius* hath published a Kalendar for *Easter*, ending in the Year 641, ascribed to *Maximus*.

Photius saith, This Author hath extraordinary well turned Periods, but that he often useth Hyperboles and Transpositions, and is not careful at all to speak properly, which renders his Writings obscure and difficult; That he affects a kind of harshness of swelling Style, which renders his Discourse displeasing and ungrateful to the Ear; That in his Rhetorical Figures he does not make choice of that which is neat and handsome; that he tires out his Reader with his Allegorical and Mystical Explications, so far distant from the Letter, and the truth of History, that one cannot see any coherence between his Answer and the Question; that yet he excels in the Allegorical and Mystical way; and that they who take delight in it, can meet with nothing more accomplished. That his very Letters are not without obscurity, which is the only Epistolary Character he hath kept to; that he is plainer and clearer in his Treatise of Charity, and in his Maxims merely Moral; Lastly, that the Conference with *Pyrrhus* is of a Style somewhat low, and that he hath not kept the Laws of Logick.

One may add to this Judgment of *Photius*, that *Maximus* handles matters after a meer Scholastical manner; that he speaks and reasons as a Logician; that he gives his Definitions, Terms, and Arguments in form; that he maketh use of great big Words, signifying no more than what might be expressed in other Terms; that he is acute and close, striketh his Adversaries home, and stands firm to his own Principles; That he was very quick of Apprehension, of Reasoning and Disputing, very free of speech, Stiff and Firm. He was of the Opinion of the *Latins* about the Procession of the Holy Ghost, Original Sin, Christ's Grace, the Celibacy of Bishops, and the Greatness and Power of the *Roman* Church. He had the Monastick Life in high esteem, and was much given to Mystical Thoughts. In a word, He was a Scholastical, Mystical, and Speculative Man.

ANASTASIUS, Disciple of Maximus.

Anastasius

Anastasius, Disciple of *Maximus*, who suffered so much with him for the same cause, wrote a Letter to the Monks of *Cagliari* against the *Monotheletes*, wherein he refutes those that said, that in Christ there were one and two Wills, from whence he con-

cluded that they admitted Three. It is in the Collections of *Anastasius Bibliothecarius*, [Published by *Sirmondus* at *Paris* 1620,] and among *Maximus's* Works. He died in Exile at *Lazica*.

ANASTASIUS, Apocryfarius of Rome.

Anastasius

[* A Commissary or Chancellor to a Bishop]

This * *Apocryfarius* of *Rome* suffered also the same Persecutions for the same cause. He wrote a Letter to *Theodosius*, Presbyter of *Gangra*, upon *St.*

Maximus's Death. There he quotes some Fragments of the Writings of *Hippolytus* Bishop of *Porto*. It is in *Anastasius's* Collections, and among *Maximus's* Works.

THEODOSIUS and THEODORUS.

Theodosius and Theodorus.

These two Brothers made an Historical Memorial of the Life and Conflicts of *Anastasius*, and the other

Champions of the Faith. This is also found among *Anastasius's* Collections.

Theodosius and Theodorus.

THEODORUS.

Theodorus.

Theodorus, Presbyter and Abbot of *Raithu*, to whom *Maximus* directed his Treatise of the Essence, and Nature, wrote a Tract upon the Incarnation. There he sets down at first the Errors of *Manes*, *Paulus Samosatensis*, *Apollinarius*, *Theodorus of Mopsuestia*, *Nestorius*, and *Eutyches*, about that Mystery. Then he expounds the Faith of the Church, opposite to those Errors.

He, shews how they have been revived by *Julian of Halicarnassus* and *Severus*, to whom he opposed the Fathers Testimonies, but we have not now this last part. This Work was publish'd in *Greek* and *Latin* by *Beza*, and printed at *Geneva* in 1576. [Quarto.] Since that time it was inserted with *Turrianus's* Version in the First Volume of the *Auctuarium Biblioth. Patrum*. [Tom. I. p. 319.]

Theodorus.

PETER of Laodicea.

Peter.

WE know nothing in particular of this Author; of whom we have a short and a bad Explication of the Lord's Prayer. It is believed he lived in the Seventh Century.

Peter.

THALASSIUS, a Monk.

Thalassius.

WE have 400. Moral Maxims or Truths, of this Author, famous only for his strict Friendship and Concerns with *Maximus*, to whom he did also pro-

pound many Questions upon the Holy Scripture [Printed in *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. 12.]

Thalassius.

ISAIAH, Abbot.

Isaiah.

Abbot *Isaiah's* Precepts are much of the same kind; they are Advices, Considerations and Instructions

useful for Monks. It is also thought he lived in this Century.

Isaiah.

THEOFRIDUS, Abbot.

Theofridus.

TWO Homilies upon Relicks are attributed to this Abbot of whom we know nothing in parti-

cular.

Theofridus.

DONATUS.

Donatus.

Donatus, the Son of the *Valdelenus*, Duke of the Country between Mount *St. Claude* and the *Alpes*, was brought up in a Religious Life by *Columbanus*, and was afterwards made Bishop of *Besancon*, toward the Year 630. where he founded two Monasteries, the one for Men, the other for Virgins. He made Rules for both.

That which he made for Monks is in the second part of *St. Benedict* of *Aniana's* Rules and is intituled, *Capitula*, to serve instead of Advertisements to the Friars of *St. Paul* and *St. Stephen*; that is, to the Monks of the Monastery of *St. Paul* (for the Monastery founded by him, at

Besancon, was called so) and to the Canons Regular of the Cathedral Church, which had *St. Stephen* for its Patron. This Rule contains nothing in it but some particular Advices.

The other Rules of *Donatus*, for the Monastery of Nuns founded by his Mother *Flavia*, is larger, well-penned, and contains very wise Constitutions, taken out of the Rules of *St. Casarius*, *St. Columbanus* and *St. Benedict*. It is found in the third Part of the Rules of *Benedict* of *Aniana*. That Bishop was present at a Council of *Challon*, upon the River *Saone*, in the Year 650.

Donatus.

VITALIANUS.

Vitalianus.

Vitalianus was chosen Bishop of *Rome*, August 29th. 656. and governed that Church fourteen Years and six Months. He hath left us some Letters.

The 1st. is directed to the Archbishop of *Creet*, upon the Bishop of *Lappa's* Complaint against the Judgment which that Bishop had given against him. *Vitalianus* saith, He hath examined that Matter in a Council, where the Acts of that Process were exhibited, and that the Bishops acknowledged the Cause had been illegally managed, and that the Bishop of *Lappa* had been wrongfully condemned: That they were greatly troubled that he had put that Bishop into Prison, and hindred him from coming to *Rome*, to clear himself: Therefore he declareth null and void all the Proceedings of the Council of the Archbishop of *Creet*, against *John* Bishop of *Lappa*: and at the same time pronounceth that Bishop to be innocent, and, as such, absolveth him. In the 2d. he intreats *Vaanus*, the Emperor's Officer, to procure that Bishop's Restoration. In the 3d. he orders *Paul*, Archbishop of *Creet*, to cause his Churches to be given him again. He complains, that a Deacon had married a Wife, since the time of his being in Orders; and that he

did minister in two Churches: He prays him to put a stop to that Disorder, and to follow no longer *Eulampius's* Counsel, he being a wicked Man, sowing Divisions among them for his own Profit. In the 4th. Letter he desires *George*, Bishop of *Syracuse*, to be favourable to *John* of *Lappa*, and to endeavour his re-establishment.

The 5th. Letter, alledged by *Bede*, is directed to the King of *Northumberland*, in *England*. He commends his Zeal, and answers him about the Time of keeping *Easter*. He promises him to send him a Bishop, when he hath met with one fit for it, and willing to go over into *England*. He thanks him for his Prayers, and sends him some Relicks.

The 6th. is directed to the *Benedictine* Monks of *Sicily*: He acquaints them how grievous it is to him, that their Monasteries and Estates have been spoiled by the Incursions of the *Barbarians*. He tells them, He sends them some Monks of the Congregation of *Mount-cassin*, and exhorts them to obey them, and to labour with them for the resetting of their Monasteries and Lands.

Vitalianus.

St. ELIGIUS.

St. Eligius.
[* Novio-
dunum or
Novio-
num.]

ST. *ELIGIUS*, born near the City *Limoges*, a Goldsmith, and a Friend of King *Dagobert*, was ordained Bishop of * *Noyon* in 646. and died in 663. *St. Owen*, who wrote his Life, tells us, he made Exhortations to his People every Day, with unwearied Labour; that his Sermons were very short, but they contained important Instructions and wholesome Advices: That Author collected them into one Discourse, containing the most usual Instructions, which *Eligius* gave to his People: They are for the most part drawn out of *St. Casarius's* Sermons, which Bishops did then make use of to preach to their People.

This Discourse was printed among *St. Austine's* Works, and now is in the end of the sixth Volume: 'Tis an Abridgment of the principal Duties of a Christian. In the first place he shews the Obligation laid upon Pastors, to instruct their People. He exhorts them to remember often their baptismal Vows, and to meditate on the Last Judgment. He shews them, that it is not enough to bear the Name of a Christian, but that we ought to act and live suitable to it. He endeavours to create in them an Abhorrence of profane Superstitions and the Relicks of Idolatry. Then he gives them sundry whole-

St. Eligius.

Some Advices to honour God, to love Enemies, to give St. Eligius Alms, to frequent Divine Service, and Sunday-Sermons,

[*(q) Cross themselves often with the Sign of the Cross.*] After the Cross was admitted into the Church, and became an Object of Worship, it was accounted of wonderful efficacy to sanctify all things, to cleanse and bless our Food, confer Grace, consecrate Sacraments, procure Remission of Sins, preserve from the Malice of the Devil, and what not; So that *Eligius* thought no better Advice could be given to the Christians, than to cross themselves with the Sign of the Cross, that they might thereby be shielded and defended from all Evils, and sanctified throughout, though the Effect proved it to be but an idle Conceit.]

[*(r) Mortal Sins.*] *i. e.* More heinous and notorious Guilt; for tho' no Sin be so venial and trivial, as the *Romanists* teach with one Consent, as neither to offend God nor deserve Damnation in its own Nature, and so only subject them to temporal Punishments; yet all Protestants disallow a *Stoical* Parity, and equality of Sins, and hold that some are greater, others less; some unto, others not unto Death; And though every the least Sin be offensive to God, and deserving Damnation in its own Nature, yet they say, some are Mortal, others Venial. 1. *By* Comparatively, and by God's Favour, as the Sins of the Elect, being committed with Reluctancy, and, without consent, are more pardonable than the Sins of wilful Offenders. 2. Because some Sins exclude not Grace the Root of Remission and Pardon out of the Soul, but others cannot stand with Grace, and so leave the Persons in a state of Wrath and Damnation who are guilty of them.]

There are Sixteen Homilies more, bearing *Eligius's* Name; but it is doubted whether they be really his, because they are made up of Passages and Quotations of the Fathers, as of *St. Augustine*, *St. Leo*, *St. Ambrose*, *Casarius of Arles*, and *St. Gregory*. These Fathers are likewise cited there, under the Name of *Saints* and *Blessed*; *St. Benedict* is there called, *most Blessed* and *most Holy Father*: They say that these Citations are affected; they add, That there be even some Passages of Authors, who wrote since *Eligius's* Time, as of *St. Isidore of Sevil*, of *Alcuin*, of *Haymo of Auxerre*: From whence they conclude, That these Sermons are the Work of an Author of the Ninth Century: Yet methinks he that composed them first was older than that Time, and many things may easily have been added to them since.

However there are yet found in them some remainders of the Ancient Discipline, not to be slighted. This is an Extract of them.

In the First Sermon, for *Christmas-day*, he shews the Happiness of the Peace, which Christ brought to the Earth, and exhorts his Hearers in the end to Almsgiving. He relates the Story of a Gardner, who being used to bestow what he earned upon the poor, was tempted to keep back part of it, in case he should fall sick; that having gathered many Crown-pieces, he got a running Sore in his Foot, which fell into a Gangreen, so that the Surgeon appointed a Day to cut off his Leg, seeing there was no other Remedy; but in the Night, the Gardner coming to himself, and having begged God's Forgiveness, for his not having continued in his Almsgiving, and promised to continue it hereafter, he was miraculously cured, and the Surgeon coming the next Day to cut off his Leg, found him gone abroad.

The Second Sermon is upon the *Purification*: After having uttered some Allegories upon that Ceremony of the Jews, he speaks of the use of the Church, to have on that Festival (*f*) *Tapers* light during the Mass; and says, that the Original of this Custom came from the *Romans*, who having collected the Tribute every fifth Year, offered solemn Sacrifices in the end of *February*, and kindled *Tapers* and *Torches* in the Town; which Ceremony was called *Lustrum*: That the Church hath changed that Superstition into an Ecclesiastical Ceremony, ordering *Tapers* to be kindled yearly in the beginning of *February*, in the time when *St. Simon* took our Lord in his Arms. One must needs be very credulous, to believe this Con-

[*(f) Tapers light during Mass, upon the Feast of the Purification.*] This Ceremony, tho' not taken from the Sacrifices called *Lustrum*, as this Author imagines, being offered in the end of *February*, yet was certainly instituted in imitation of a Festival, celebrated at *Rome*, either in remembrance of *Ceres's* search after *Proserpina*, or in honour of *Februa*, the Mother of *Mars*, which were both solemniz'd with *Tapers* burning in their Hands, by the *Romans*. These Superstitions the Bishops of the Church very much abhorred, yet because it conduced greatly to the Conversion of the

jeature, which hath neither Truth nor Likelihood in it.

the same Ceremonies to be used by the Christians on the Feast of the *Purification* as had been used upon the Calends of *February* at *Rome*: And this the learned and judicious *Rhenanus* on *Tertullian* confidently asserts. *Negari non potest Ardendum Cererum, quos hodie Christiani die Purificatae Mariae ex more circumferunt a Februalibus Romanorum sacris Originem sumpsisse. Pertinaci paganismo mutatione subventum est, quem rei in totum sublatio potius irritasset.*

The Third Sermon is upon the Fast of *Lent*; therein he enlargeth upon the good Effects of Fasting.

The Fourth is on *Holy Thursday*: He observeth, that on that Day was made the Reconciliation of Publick Penitents, guilty of Crimes, which deserved that the Bishop should separate them from the Altar, and then reconcile them: Then he addresseth his Speech to those Penitents, and exhorts them to examine themselves whether they be reconcil'd to God or not, because it may happen, that although they be reconciled by the Ministry of the Bishop, yet they be not so with God, who alone grants the true Reconciliation: He shews them, that to be truly reconciled, they ought to be, according to the Apostle, *new Creatures*, purged from the Crimes of the *Old Man*; That they who continue in their sinful Habits, should not imagine that they can thoroughly be reconcil'd before they have made (*t*) *Satisfaction* proportionable to the greatness of their Sins. 'If saith he, ye repent after a godly sort, and ye be sincerely purposed and sincerely desirous to sin no more, ye shall be truly reconciled by Jesus Christ and by us, to whom he hath committed the Ministry of Reconciliation. But if you be not in that Disposition, do not flatter your selves, don't deceive your selves, for ye cannot deceive God, as ye deceive Men; and he who by offending him is become his Enemy, can no otherwise be Friends again with him than by making him Satisfaction. Do not look upon Bishops as the Authors of your Reconciliation: but Ministers of it; It is Jesus Christ who does invisibly absolve and reconcile Men: As for us, we discharge our Ministry when we do outwardly and visibly perform the Ceremonies of Reconciliation: Nevertheless he does comfort those who have not repented thoroughly, giving them Hope, that provided they forsake their Sins heartily, they may obtain Forgiveness, and be truly reconciled.' He adds, 'That there be several means of expiating our Sins, and obtaining the remission of them.' And he instances in these, a charitable Disposition, Alms-giving, Sorrow, Confession of Sins, Mortifying of the Flesh and Spirit, Amendment of Life, the Intercession of Holy and Just Men, and the Forgiving of Enemies.

[*(t) Made Satisfaction proportionable to the greatness of their Sins.*] Tho' these Words seem to come up to the Doctrine of Satisfaction, held in the Church of *Rome*, yet it does not appear that the Fathers of this Age had any other Notion of Satisfaction, than that which was received in the Ages before, which is much different from, and much more Orthodox, than the Popish. We have a Definition of it, p. 2. given by *Isidore of Sevil*, to this effect: 'Satisfaction is an Exclusion of the Causes and Occasions of Sin, and a Satisfaction from Sinning;' which is almost the same with *St. Augustine's* *Satisfactio est peccatorum causas excindere, & eorum suggestionibus nullum aditum indulgere*. This is the Nature of true Repentance, which being proportion'd in some measure to the greatness of our Guilt, the more penitent and hearty, by how much our Sins are more heinous and aggravating, is all the Satisfaction that God expects of us, besides a firm Faith and Dependence on the Merits of Jesus Christ. The Popish Satisfaction is a clear different thing, as they define, it, thus: It is an equivalent Compensation made to the offended Justice of God for the Injury done unto him by Sin, partly by our Actions, and partly by our Sufferings, whereby we deliver our selves from Divine Vengeance, and save our selves from Punishment. A Doctrine unknown to Antiquity! Of Tears I read, to make Satisfaction I read not, saith

St. Ambrose: Yea, *Aquinas* himself says, to pretend to make Satisfaction for Sin, is an Injury to Christ's Death: And that this Father was of the same Judgment with Antiquity, the following Words shew, if ye repent after a godly sort, and be sincerely desirous to sin no more, ye shall be reconciled by Jesus Christ, and by us his Ministers.]

The Fifth Homily is upon the Sacrifice of *Isaac*, it is very short, and hath nothing remarkable in it.

The Sixth is also upon *Holy Thursday*. Therein he exhorts all Christians to Repentance, and to expiate their lighter Faults with Fastings, Watchings, Alms-giving, and other Works of Charity. He warns them not to put off their Repentance till the hour of Death, which often surprizes us, when we least think of it, without giving us one moment to bethink our selves.

The

St. Eligius.

Tertul. l. 5. cont. Mar.

Aug. de Ausline's Satisfactio est peccatorum causas excindere, & eorum suggestionibus nullum aditum indulgere. c. 54.

Greg. 14. Val. 10. 4. d. 7. q. 14. the Injury done unto him by Sin, partly by our Actions, and partly by our Sufferings, whereby we deliver our selves from Divine Vengeance, and save our selves from Punishment. A Doctrine unknown to Antiquity! Of Tears I read, to make Satisfaction I read not, saith

Ambro. in Luc. Ser. 46.

St. Eligius.

The Seventh is a short Exhortation to the Penitents and Faithful, to give God Thanks for graciously granting them the favour of Reconciliation.

The Eighth is a long Discourse to the Clergy, the People, and the Publick Penitents. He exhorts Presbyters, who govern Parishes to be an Example to the People under their Charge. He recommends to all the Faithful the love of their Neighbour, and the forgiving of Enemies; and exhorts them to purifie themselves from light Sins, that they may escape not only the Fire that shall burn the Ungodly

for ever; but (u) that Fire also, through which the Righteous who are not wholly purged from their Sins, shall pass in the day of Judgment. He exhorts also great Sinners to repent, covering themselves with Hair-cloth, and lifting up their Hands to Heaven, that they may be reconciled by the imposition of the Bishop's hands; and he warns them not to relapse into Sin after Reconciliation. Lastly, he treats of the Ceremonies used by the Church on *Holy Thursday*, which are, besides the Reconciliation of Penitents, (v) the Blessing of the Holy Oyl, the Consecrating of the Chrism, the Washing of Feet, of Altars, of Sacred Vessels, of the Floor and the Walls of Churches. He speaks clearly of the real Presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist; and says, that, as Christ was really and substantially born of the Virgin; so likewise (w) Christians do truly receive under the Mysteries, the Lord's Body, and Blood, tho' the appearance of the Bread and Wine remain, because Men would

[(u) That Fire, through which the Righteous, who are not wholly purged from their Sins shall pass in the day of Judgment.] The Doctrine of Purgatory which M. Du Pin would seem to build upon this Expression, and another of like Importance, p. 59. taken out of the Works of Julian of Toledo, is not the same with that which is meant by their words, which is no other than what the Fathers before them had held, tho' perhaps not so firmly, as it was believed in these latter Ages. Tertullian, H. m. 14. Cyprian and Origen, were of Opinion, that after the Resurrection, before the Saints entered into Glory, they should pass through a Purging Fire, to refine their Souls from their Dross, their Wood, Hay and Strubble before they can become Vessels of Honour fit to obtain a place in the Mansions of Bliss. This seems to be St. Eligius's Opinion here, because he says, that the Righteous shall pass through a Purging Fire in the day of Judgment. From these Elder

Origen
H. m. 14.
in Luc.
Tertul. de
anima, c.
55. 1. Cor.
3. 12.

Hieron. in
Isa. l. 18.
c. ult.
August.
Enchirid.
c. 67, 68.
Jerome, that there is a moderate and gentle Sentence of the
69. Aug. Judge concerning the Burning away the Sins of Christians. And
de civ. Dei, St. Augustine, If betwixt Death and Judgment the Souls of the
l. 2. c. 26. Departed be said to suffer a Fire of Transitory Tribulation burn-
Aug. de ing up worldly smaller faults, I reprove it not, because perhaps
pec. mer. 'tis true. So feeble was the Belief of a Purgatory among
& rem. the Ancients for some hundred Years. And as it was only a
c. 28. probable Opinion at most, so it was never looked upon as a sepa-
Cypr. ad rate State, but only as it were a Purgation in their Passage to Glory;
Dem. Tert. for it was a settled Doctrine in the Primitive Church, that there is no
de Bapt. middle Place; That a Man cannot be any where, but either with
Roffen. af- the Devil or Christ, in Hell or in Heaven. There are but two
fert. Luth. Places after this Life, one for the Elect, another for the Repro-
Confut. bate. So that the Popish Purgatory, which is a place of Tor-
Artic. 18. ment, wherein they that have not perfected their Obedience
p. 86. here, stay to make Satisfaction for their Sins, and then enter in-
to Heaven, was altogether unknown to the Ancients. And in-
deed this Pol. Virgil and Roffensis acknowledge. Nemo, saith the
latter, nunc Orthodoxus dubitat an Purgatorium sit, &c. No true
Catholick now-a-days but believes a Purgatory, altho' there is
little or no mention of it in Antiquity; and the Greek Church
believes it not to this day. In reality, Purgatory is a Novel
Invention as it is now taught, a perfect contrivance for the
Church's advantage, never received for Doctrine till the Coun-
cil of Florence, Anno 1448.

[(v) Blessing the Holy Oyl, Consecrating the Chrism.] It was a Custom among the Bishops, upon some great Festival, with solemn Prayers and Ceremonies, to consecrate that Oyl which the Presbyters used in the Baptism and Confirmation of Children and Others. In some Churches they did it at *Easter*, and in others particularly in the French Church, where Eligius was Bishop, upon *Holy Thursday*; and from the Bishops, the Priests fetched it themselves, or in case of necessity, sent for it for the Service of their Churches.]

[(w) Christians do truly receive under the Mysteries, the Lord's Body and Blood—De veritate Carnis & Sanguinis, tho' the appearance of the Bread and Wine remain.] This, and such like Expressions, which might be produced in great Numbers from the Books of the Ancients, who unanimously teach, that in the Sacrament is the Body and Blood of Christ. And tho' before the Consecration it is *αὐτὸς ἄρτος & οἶνος*, meer Bread and Wine, yet afterwards 'tis verily the Body of Christ. Truly his Flesh, truly his Blood, are really no more than the very words of Christ, *This is my Body, This is my Blood*, and are only true in a figurative Sense, i. e. by a Change of Condition, Sanctification and Usage: In which Sense, the Church of England thus delivers her self in the Catechize, *That the Body and Blood of Christ is verily and indeed taken, and received by the Faithful in the Lord's Supper*. For we are so certain, that to eat Christ's Body Spiritually, is to eat him Really, that there is no other way to eat

him Really, but by Spiritual Manducation. Christ is as really present Spiritually as Corporeally, and we receive it as well by Faith as by Bodily Eating. There can, therefore, be no Grounds from the Words of this Father to infer a Transubstantiation the in Sacrament, since they may be better understood of the Spiritual Presence. Nay, these Expressions, The appearance of Bread and Wine remain under the Mysteries, plainly shew this to be the Sense. They are to the Senses, Bread and Wine; to the Soul, they are really the Body and Blood of Christ; on them we feed by Faith. And thus we must understand the Expression of the same Father, p. 37. seq. ad. w]

St. Eligius.

abhor drinking Blood and eating Flesh; but there can be no doubt, but it is verily received. *De veritate Carnis & Sanguinis ejus nullus relictus est ambigendi locus*. He confesseth, the Apostles did not receive it fasting; but he says, that for all that, they ought not to find Fault with the Custom of the Universal Church, which requires; that it be always received fasting; because the Holy Spirit, whereby she is governed, in Honour of so great a Sacrament, would have Christ's Body to enter into the Christians Mouths, before any other Meat was received in; and it is upon that Account, that this Practice is observed every where. Lastly, he treats of the Question of frequent Communion, and enquires whether it be good to communicate every day. Thereupon he says, that there be some Persons, who wish, that they would make choice of those days, in which Men live more Soberly and Godly; but others think, that if they be not guilty of any Sin that deserveth being debarred from the Altar, put to Penance, and then reconciled by the Bishop's Authority, that they may come very often to the Sacrament. He leaves every one at his Liberty to do as he shall think best, according to his Godly Motion; and propounds, after St. Augustine, the Examples of Zaccarius and the Centurion. He warns Christians, that if they exclude themselves from the Eucharist, they shall perish with Hunger; but yet, if they come to it unworthily, they shall eat and drink their own Damnation. Lastly, he does vehemently urge great Sinners to Repentance, and to procure their own Separation, from the Altar, by the Judgment of the Bishop; and prays them to consider, That that State of Separation is an Image of the final Judgment, when they see the Just coming to the Eucharist, whilst themselves are excluded from it. In the beginning of that Homily there are some Periods taken out of a Sermon of *Casarius of Arles*, but in that time they commonly used that Bishop's Sermons.

In the Ninth Homily, he exhorts Sinners to cure themselves of their Sins by Repentance.

In the Tenth, he speaks also of the Ceremonies of the *Thursday* before *Easter*, that on that day they set some Prisoners at Liberty.

The Eleventh Homily is also upon the *Thursday* before *Easter*; he speaks to the Faithful and the Penitents. To the first he recommends Faith and Charity towards God and their Neighbours; on which Virtue he bestows a large Eulogium, and recommends the forgiving of Enemies. He speaks of the Practice of the Church, to say every day (x) the Canonical Hours. He stirs up all Christians to

Prayer, Fasting and Repen-

[(x) Canonical Hours.] The Ancients had their several Hours for Prayer and Devotion both by Day and Night, in imitation of the Apostles. This must be acknowledged on all hands. Tertullian mentions them as of common use among the Christians in his time. *Quamvis semper & ubique & omni tempore orandum est, tamen tres horæ ut insigniores in rebus humanis, ita solenniores sunt in precibus Divinis, quod suadet Danielis argumentum ter die Orantis*. As Daniel prayed three times a day, so did the Christians in the first devout times. The same also doth St. Jerome deliver as an Apostolical Tradition. *Tria sunt tempora quibus Deo flectenda sunt Genua, Tertiam Horam, Sextam & Nonam Ecclesiastica Traditio intelligit; Denique Tertia hora descendit S. Spiritus super Apostolos, Sexta Petrus volens comedere ad Orationem ascendit in Cenaculum, nona Petrus & Joannes ascendeabant in Templum*. Wherein St. Jerome tells us, That it was an Ecclesiastical Tradition to be observed by the Christians in imitation of the Apostles, to pray at the Third, Sixth and Ninth Hours. And so also the same Father prescribes Hours of Prayers in the Night, and particularly enjoins Mid-night, so to be observed. But as their Hours for Prayer were but three by Day, and two or three by Night: so they were for private, not publick Devotion, freely and voluntarily performed, not imposed, and being thus used are highly to be approved. But as they have since degenerated into Ceremony and Superstition, and have not only received an Addition of four Hours more to make them up seven; but are imposed on the Priests only in the Romish Church, and by them are made a Burden or a Task, rather than a Duty; they have been justly abolished by our Reformers; not but that 'tis lawful and commendable, for any pious Persons to follow the old Apostolick Custom, if they see it helpful to Devotion.]

Dan. 6. 10.

Hieron. ad

Eustoch.

Aet. 2. 1.

15. 10. 9.

3. 1.

Hieron. ad

Eustoch.

Athan. de

Virgin.

Basil. Quest.

37.

Pol. Virg.

l. 6. c. 2.

tance; he prescribes to Sinners the Confession of their Sins, in order to doing Penance for them; and at last directs his Speech to Penitents, after this manner. 'To those Persons,

St. Eligius. 'faith he, who stand here in a Penitential Habit, with a foul mournful Countenance, their Hair torn and flying abroad, testifying, as far as we can judge by their Actions, that they have lamented their Sins, and mortified in themselves the Vices of the Flesh. He lets them know, they are to understand, that altho' they be desirous to receive the Imposition of Hands, nevertheless they ought to be persuaded, they shall not receive the absolution of their Crimes, if the Divine Goodness do not pardon them, giving them the Grace of Contrition; because, as *St. Gregory* faith, the Bishop's Absolution is then only true, when it is agreeable with the Judgment of him, who judges the Secrets of the Hearts, which is figured by the Resurrection of *Lazarus*, whom Christ raised to Life first, before he ordered his Disciples to loose him; and thus all Pastors must have a care, to loose and absolve none, but such whose Souls Christ hath quickened again by his Grace.' After these Words, he invites them to shew some Marks of their Conversion; which they having done, by lifting up their Hands to Heaven, he went on in his Discourse, setting forth the Effects of true Repentance, which are, to satisfy God, to lament their Sins past, and to commit them no more.

The 12th. Homily is upon Charity on Holy Thursday.

The 13th. for the same Day. He exhorts all Christians to purge themselves from their daily Sins by Prayer and Almsgiving; and he advertiseth them in the end, That they should not abhor publick Penitents, as being great Sinners, because among those that are not doing Penance, there may be some guilty of more grievous Sins. He deploreth the Misery of those, who do not confess them, nor do Penance for them.

In the 14th. he exhorts Christians diligently to prepare themselves for the worthy receiving of the Eucharist at Easter.

[* Vide Note (w)] In the 15th. he speaks again very earnestly of the real Presence. 'Know ye, my dear Brethren, faith he, and firmly believe, that, as the * Flesh which Jesus Christ took in the Virgin's Womb, is his true Body, which was offered up for our Salvation; so likewise the Bread which he gave to his Disciples, and which the Priests consecrate daily in

' the Church, is the true Body of Christ. They are not two Bodies, 'tis the same Body, which is broken and sacrificed. *St. Eligius.* ' This is Jesus Christ which is broken and sacrificed, tho' he remains sound and whole.' Then he exhorts all Christians, Clerks, Laicks and Religious, who perceive themselves guilty of the Sins of Envy, Calumny, Hatred, Fornication and Perjury, to purify themselves on this Day, confessing their Iniquity to God. And as to those that have committed greater Crimes, and are doing Penance publicly, he warns them to fall no more into those Sins. He adds, that there be grievous Offenders, whose Crimes are so secret, that they cannot be admitted to do publick Penance. ' That those Offenders are to be excluded from the Church for a while, because that altho' they be not reconciled by the Imposition of Hands, and receive not Absolution, they ought to mortify their Bodies by Works of Repentance, and heal their Souls by good Deeds.

This would make one think, that publick Offences only, were then liable to publick Penance, and as to them whose Crimes were altogether secret and hidden, they did only advise them to separate themselves from the Church Assemblies, and to do Penance secretly and privately.

This appears yet by the 16th. Homily; for having exhorted all Christians generally to repent, and to abstain from grievous Crimes for the future, he directs his Speech to two Persons whom a publick Offence had obliged to do publick Penance. He exhorts them sincerely to lament their Sins, and to commit them no more. In that Homily there is an unwarrantable Proposition, related under the Name of the Wise Man; that it is as great a Crime for a Man to lie with his Wife, as to eat Flesh in Lent. Besides these Homilies, we have a Letter of *St. Eligius* among those of *Desiderius* Bishop of † *Cabors*.

St. Eligius was an able and learned Man for his time; [† Of *Ca-* *durcum.*] he had read *St. Cyprian*, *St. Austine*, *St. Gregory*, and some other Latin Fathers, and imitated them. He was a Lover of Ecclesiastical Discipline, and a Follower of the Tradition of those Fathers, as near as the Age, he lived in, could permit. His Sermons are better than those of several other Latin Preachers, both for Matter and Style.

A G A T H O.

Agatho. Pope *Agatho* may deservedly be ranked among Ecclesiastical Authors, because of the long Letter he writ to the Emperor *Constantine*, inserted in the Acts of the 6th. Council; in which he does largely confute the Error of the *Monothelites*: But we ought not to value much another Letter, ascribed to this Pope, directed to *Ethelred*, King of the *Mercians*, to *Theodorus* of *Canterbury*, and to the Abbot *Sexulphus*; which seems to be a supposititious Piece, made by some English Monk, and contains nothing

remarkable. We shall speak of this Pope's first Letter, when we come to treat of the Acts of the 6th. Council, and of another Letter written upon the same Subject and the same Occasion, by *Datian*, Bishop of *Pavia*, in the Name of *Mansuetus*, Bishop of *Milan*, which is also among the Acts of this Council. This Pope died the 10th. of January, in 682. after he had governed the Church of Rome 3 Years, 6 Months, and 25 Days.

L E O II.

Leo II. After *Agatho's* Death, *Leo II.* was chosen in his Room. *Constantine* the Emperor, hearing of his Election, did immediately write a Letter to him, set down in the end of the 6th. Council; but *Leo* was not ordained till August, in the Year 682. after the Return of *John*, Bishop of *Porto*, one of the Legates, whom *Agatho* had sent to the Council. And some believe, his Ordination was put off 'till August, in the Year following: But it is not likely; for in May, of this Year, he did examine and approve in a Synod, the Acts of the 6th. Council; and in the End of the same Year, sent them into Spain. He died the Year after, viz. June 28. 684.

The Emperor's Letter directed to *Leo*, wherein he acquaints him, that the Council hath confirmed Pope *Agatho's* Doctrine, and what was done in the 6th. Council, is in the Acts of that Council. *Baronius* pretends, that these two Letters are supposititious, but his Conjectures are grounded only upon false Dates (a), added by some Latin Author, and wanting in the Greek Original, or upon *Anastasius's* false Chronology.

(a) False Dates.] In the Title of the first Letter it is said, that it was sent in December, Indict. X. *Agatho* was then living, but they must set down some other Month, for it was delivered in June, Indict. X. It is known, that these Titles, before the true Inscriptions, are added. The second Letter hath no Date in the Greek, and the Date in the Latin is visibly false. In the Body, there is mention made of the X. Indict. of June before; which agreeth very well with our Hypothesis. *Leo* was chosen in the Beginning of 682. Indict. X. In June he receiveth the Acts of the Council, and the Emperor's Letter; he was ordained in August following, and he writes an Answer in the Beginning of the next Year, Indict. XI. *Anastasius* hath turned all topsy-turvy. He says, *Agatho* was yet living in March 682. that the Holy See was vacant one Year, seven Months. If that be true, *Leo* was not ordained Bishop till October 683, which

Besides these two Letters of *Leo II.* there are four more that were sent into Spain about the Affair of the 6th. Council, the Definition whereof was sent into that Kingdom by *Peter*, Notary of the Church of Rome. The first is directed to all the Spanish Bishops. He acquaints them with what was defined in the General Council, and exhorts them to receive its Definitions. He recommends the same thing in particular, to a certain Bishop called *Quiricus*, in the second Letter. In the third, he exhorts an Earl, named *Simplicius*, to endeavour the maintaining of that Doctrine. And in the fourth, he relates to King *Ervigius*, how the Faith of the Church was confirmed and explained in the 6th. Council, and the Hereticks condemned; and exhorts him to cause all the Bishops of his Kingdom, to receive and subscribe the Definition of that Council. *Baronius* would bring these Letters also into doubt, because *Honorius's* Name is found therein among the Bishops condemned; but these Conjectures are so weak (b), that it is not worth the while to answer them.

cannot be made out. *Baronius* endeavours moreover to bring in to Suspicion of Falshood, *Constantine's* Letter to *Leo*, because he says, that he had written of that Matter to *Agatho*; which is not true, says *Baronius*, because the Emperor's Letter was not directed to *Agatho* but to *Donus*. But it is very easy to answer, that this Letter was written to *Agatho*, because it was he that received it, and answered it. That which troubles *Baronius* most of all, is, that *Honorius* is anathematized in *Leo's* Letter; but there is no reason for it.

(b) Conjectures are so weak.] There is but one of any Difficulty, namely, that it is said in these Letters, that the 6th. Council was finished in the IX. Indiction. But the Words of the Letter are not to be understood thus; it is merely said there, that the Question about the *Monothelites* was ended in a Council held at *Constantinople* in the IX. Indict.

B E N E D I C T II.

Benedict II. finished what his Predecessor had begun, by writing to the Notary *Peter*, who was sent into Spain, to cause the Definition of the 6th. Council to be subscribed to, and sent him a Copy of the Letter written to King *Erwigius* by his Predecessor. *Leo's* Letters and the Definition of the 6th. Council came too late to be delivered to the 13th. Council of *Toledo*; so that

the Business was terminated but in the 14th. Council, held in that City in 684. In November, where the Faith established by the 6th. Council was confirmed. The authentick Acts of this Council, are an invincible Proof of the Truth of *Leo II's* and *Benedict's* Letters against Cardinal *Baroni-us's* frivolous Conjectures.

D R E P A N I U S F L O R U S.

Drepanius, a French Poet, flourished towards the Middle of the 7th. Century. We have some Poems of his; the 22d, 26th, and 27th. *Psalms* put into Verse; the Song of *Ananias*, *Azarias*, and *Misael* in the Furnace; an Hymn to St. *Michael*; an Hymn upon the Paschal Taper; a Letter to *Moduin*, Bishop of *Autun*, upon the reading of the Holy Scripture; a Thankf-

giving to one of his Friends, who stood up in his Defence; and a Letter to a Grammarian, to desire him to send him an Answer. His Style is pretty Poetical, he does not use many barbarous Terms, but he does not place them in an Order Poetical enough, and uses sometimes Words fit only for Prose.

I L D E P H O N S U S Bishop of Toledo.

Ildephonsus, a Monk, and afterwards Abbot of the Monastery of *Agali*, was elected Bishop of *Toledo* in 658. which was the 9th. Year of the Reign of King ** Receswinth*, and governed that Church nine Years, and two Months. He made a Book of the Ecclesiastical Writers, for a Continuation of *Isidorus's*, to the End whereof *Julian*, his Successor, added the Catalogue of his Works, after he had made an Encomium upon him, and taken notice of the principal Circumstances of his Life. He hath composed, says he, several Books very well written, and much to be valued. He divided them himself thus: The first part comprehends the following Tracts, a Writing of his own Weakness, by way of a Prosopopeia; a Tract of the Virgin *Mary's* perpetual Virginity against three Infidels; a small Tract upon the Proprieties of the three Divine Persons; another Tract containing Reflections upon his daily Actions; another of Reflections upon Sacred Things; a Book of the Knowledge of Baptism; a Treatise of the Advancement of the Spiritual Solitariness, which he joined to the first Part of his Works. The second comprehends several Letters written to several Persons, and sometimes under different Names, in which there be many large Answers. The third part was made up of Masses, Hymns and Sermons. The fourth contained many small Works in Prose and Verse; among which there be some Epitaphs and Epigrams. He had moreover begun several other Tracts, which he left imperfect.

Of all these Tracts, there is none left to us, but that of *Mary's* perpetual Virginity, wherein he asserts, against *Jo- vinian*, that she kept her Virginity in her bringing forth; against *Elvidius*, that she remained a Virgin after she had brought forth Jesus Christ; and against the *Jews*, that she conceived without the Loss of her Virginity. He enlargeth upon the Mystery of the Incarnation, and the God-head of Christ. This Treatise is full of devout Considerations, with a Preface to it, containing many pious Thoughts. The Style is sententious and concise.

Some ascribe moreover to *Ildephonsus* of *Toledo*, another Treatise of *Mary's* perpetual Virginity, and * twelve Sermons on the Purification, the Birth, and Assumption of the Virgin; but the Style of these Works, which are not mentioned by *Julian*, is so different from that of *Ildephonsus*, that we may be assured they belong to another Author. They are written in a more dogmatical Way, and are full of Citations from the Fathers, and of Reasonings. Nay, and there are found in them some Passages of Authors that lived after *Ildephonsus*, as of St. *Bernard*, of the Author of the *Commentary upon the seven Penitential Psalms*, which is under the Name of St. *Gregory of Ratram*, and *Paschasius*.

[(y) The Virgin *Mary* was sanctified in her Mother's Womb, and was born without Original Sin.] It is very probable that this Work, which is falsely attributed to *Ildephonsus* in Mr. *Du Pin's* Judgment, was forged by an Author of a much later Date, since it was the constant Opinion of the Church for above eleven hundred years after Christ, that the Virgin *Mary* was not only born in Original Sin, as all other Women are, but was also guilty of ma-

This Author teaches, that (y) the Virgin was sanctified in her Mother's Womb, and was born without Original Sin. He believes, 'tis upon that Account, the Feast of her Nativity is kept; but he does not speak of the Conception. He asserts, that she suffered no Pain in her bringing forth. He says, that Jesus Christ came out of the Virgin by penetrating through her Bowels, after the same manner that he came forth

out of the Grave by Penetration, and charges the opposite Opinion with Heresie. He affirms, that she committed no Sin in her Life. He commends her highly, and looks upon her as the most excellent of all Creatures. He describes her Assumption in a stately manner; but yet he dares not affirm she ascended into Heaven in Soul and Body; because, tho' that Opinion, says he, be pious, yet it cannot be affirmed as a Certainty, lest we should deliver doubtful Things for unquestionable Truths. *Quod licet primum sit credere, a nobis tamen non debet affirmari, ne videamur dubia pro certis recipere.* This is what this Author says, whom I believe to be much later than *Ildephonsus* of *Toledo*; and to belong to the ninth Century of the Church. This Opinion is suitable to that of *Usuardus*, that lived in the same time, who speaking in his Martyrology of the Virgin's Body, says, the Church had rather confess, that she knows not where it is; than teach any thing Apocryphal and Frivolous about it, *Plus elegit Sobrietas Ecclesie cum pietate nescire, quam aliquid Frivolum aut Apocryphum docere.*

in which it was decreed thus, hath been made touching the Conception of the glorious Virgin; We having seen, and diligently examined the Reasons, do define and declare, that the Doctrine which teaches her never to have been Actually subject to Original Sin, but always free from it, and from all Actual Sin, is to be received and approved, as the most Catholick Doctrine, and it shall not be lawful for any to teach the contrary. This Decree hath been confirmed by Pope *Sixtus* the IV, and since by the Council of *Trent*; so that it is now become an Article of Faith in the Roman Church, unless it be with the *Dominicans*, who are Hereticks in this Point. And from the Roman Forge it may be reasonably supposed, that this Book came, and perhaps from the *Franciscans*, who are the most zealous Patrons of her immaculate Conception.]

The Works, bearing *Ildephonsus's* Name, have been published by *Reuardenius*, [at *Paris* in 1576,] and are extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, [Tom. 12.] except the Treatise Of illustrious Men, which was printed together with those of St. *Jerome*, *Gennadius*, and *Isidore*, [at *Antwerp* in 1639.]

Dacherius hath published, in the first Volume of his *Spicilegium*, some Letters of *Ildephonsus* of *Toledo*, of *Quiricus*, and *Idatius*, Bishops of *Barcelona*.

ny. Actual Sins. *Austine* imputes to her Original Sin, *Virginis caro, etiam si de peccati propagine venit, non tamen de peccati propagine concepit*, altho' she was born in Sin, yet she did not conceive in Sin. And to the same purpose do *Ambrose*, *Chrysostome*, and others, speak of her. And in like manner of Actual Sin many of the Fathers in their Comments upon *John* 2. 3. think her guilty, for it is certain, that our Saviour did reprove some Fault or Error in her. This *Maldonate* on *John* II. part 11. acknowledges, tho' not of their Mind. And indeed the Holy Spirit by her own Mouth gives us an invincible Proof of her Sinfulness, inspiring her to rejoice in God her Saviour, as standing in need of him to save her from her Sins, as well as other Women. But in these last Ages of the Church, the immoderate Veneration given to the Virgin *Mary* hath produced an Opinion, that *Mary* was by a singular and extraordinary Privilege preserved from Original Sin. *Scotus* was the first School-man that held it, and maintained it in his Disputes, but met with great Opposition in this Point, both in the Schools, and Church, and tho' it got ground a little by time, yet it was a Subject of Contest among the Learned till it was fully determined in the Council of *Basil*, Anno 1439,

Ildephonsus Bishop of *Toledo*. *Aug. de Gen. ad lit. l. 10. c. 18.* *Amb. cont. 6. in Psal. 118.* *Chrysost. Hom. 45. in Matt.* *Chrysost. Hom. 20. in Joan.* *Lut. 1. 47. Scot. in 3. dist. 4. q. 1.*

Conc. Basil. Sessio. 36.

T A I O, or T A G O.

Taiō, Bishop of *Saragoza*, flourished about the Middle of the 7th. Century. He reduced into five Books, under certain Titles, all that he found in St. *Gregory's* Works about Divinity, without mixing with it any Arguments, or Testimonies of the other Fathers, save only of St. *Augustine*. The first Book of that Collection, treats of God and his Attributes. The second, of the Incarnation, and the Preaching of the Gospel, of Pastors and their Flocks. The third, of the divers Orders of the

Church, of Virtues and Vices. The fourth, of the Judgments of God, of Temptations, and of Sins. And the fifth, of Reprobates, of the final Judgment, and the Resurrection. This Collection is not * printed, and it does not seem very necessary to publish it. *Mabillon*, from whom we have learned what we have now said of it, hath published this Author's Letter to *Quiricus*. The Cardinal of *Aguirre* promised another Letter of *Taiō* to *Eugenius* of *Toledo*.

[* But is among *Thuanus's* MSS.]

L E O N T I U S Bishop in Cyprus.

Leontius, Bishop of a Town formerly called *Naples*, now *Lemnice*, in the Isle of *Cyprus*, is honourably quoted in the 7th. Council, *Act. 4*. They produce a long Fragment, which it's said is taken out of the fifth Book of his Apology for the *Christians* against the *Jews*. He maintains there, that neither Crosses nor Images are worshipped, but only have outward Respects paid them, terminating in God and Jesus Christ. It is observed in the

same place, that he is the Author of the Life of St. *John* the Alms-giver, of St. *Simeon* the simple, and of some other Works, and that he lived under *Maurice* the Emperor. *Combes* hath * published two Homilies of that Author, the one upon the Blessed *Simeon*, when he received Christ into his Arms, and the other upon the Feast-day kept between *Easter* and *Whitsunday*, on the *Wednesday* of the fourth Week after *Easter*.

[* In his *Antiquarium* p. 681. 702.]

M A R C U L P H U S.

This Author's Preface, to his two Books of * Forms, shews, that he was a *French* Monk, and that he made that Work after he was 70 Years old, and dedicated it to a Bishop named *Landericus*, but [* *Formæ* seeing he does not say, of what Place he was Bishop, some have thought it was *Landericus* of *Paris* (a), who was famous in the Reign of *Chris* the Son of *Dagobert*, towards the Year 660. Others pretend that it is a Bishop of *Meaux*, who lived in the time of *Pepin* and *Charles* the Great, towards the Year 750.

However, these Forms are of the time of the second Race of our Kings, for *Marculphus* having written them about the 70th. Year of his Age, and having gathered the Forms in all the time of his Ancestors, and those but in small number, there can be no doubt, but the most part of them are very ancient.

We shall speak here but of those concerning Ecclesiastical Matters.

The first is the Form of a Privilege granted by a Bishop to a Monastery. It is directed to the Abbot, and the whole Society of the Monastery. Therein he says, that being willing to provide for their Quiet, and conform himself to the Custom, according to which the Monasteries of *Lerins*, *Againe*, *Luxeuil*, and a great number more, enjoy the Privilege of Liberty, he made the following Constitutions, to be observed by the Monks, and the Bishops his Successors; that the Monks shall receive Orders from the Bishop; that he shall bless the Altars in their Church *gratis*; that he shall every Year give them the Holy Christ, if they demand it of him; that he shall make him their Abbot that shall be chosen out of themselves, by the unanimous Consent of the Society; that he shall in no wise meddle with the Affairs, Persons, or the Revenues, present or to come, belonging to the Monastery; that he shall take nothing of what shall be bestowed upon them, nor of their Offerings made upon their Altars, that he shall not come into their Monastery unless he be called into it; and when he shall be desired to go thither, after the Celebration of the Mysteries, he shall withdraw, to leave them in Peace; that the Abbot shall correct his Monks, and that the Bishop shall not suffer them to be in the City.

In the second Form, the King confirms the Exemption granted by the Bishop, particularly as to what concerns the Revenues, and extends the Prohibition of invading them to all sorts of Persons.

The third is a Form, whereby the King exempts the Bishops Lands from the secular Jurisdiction.

(a) Some have thought it was *Landericus* of *Paris*.] *M. Bignon* is of that Mind, but *M. Lamoignon* believes, it is the Bishop of *Meaux*, and he proves it, 1. Because *Marculphus* says in his Forms, that in his time there was an infinite number of Monasteries in *France*, which he pretends cannot agree with *Clotus* and *Dagobert's* time, and proves it by *Eligius's* Life written by St. *Ouen*, l. i. c. 21. where it is observed there was not then such a great number of Monasteries in *France*, and that those that were there, were not very regular. 2. Because in *Marculphus* there be several Manners of Speech, which he pretends were not in use but since *Clotus* and *Dagobert's* time. F.

The 4th. is the Confirmation of an Exemption already granted.

The 5th. is a Form directed by the Prince to the Bishops, whereby he enjoins them to ordain such a Person, chosen by him, with the Bishops and Lords of his Realm, to be Bishop in the room of a Bishop deceased.

The 6th. is an Order of the Prince to a Bishop to ordain him whom he hath chosen.

The 7th. is a Request of the Inhabitants of a Town to the King, to beseech him to elect such an one Bishop of their Town: At the Foot whereof is the Prince's Order. These Forms do shew, that from that time the Kings of *France* enjoyed the Nomination to Bishopricks, and that Bishops were ordained by the Metropolitans, without any need to go to *Rome*.

The 14th, 15th, and 16th. are Forms of Donations made to some Churches by their Princes.

The 17th. is a Permission of the Prince to make a Man Clerk for the Service of a Church, or a Monastery, and to cut off his Hair.

The 26th. is an Order of the Prince to the Bishop, to give again to a private Man a Farm belonging to him, if not, to send one in his Name into his Court, to give an Account of that Business.

The 27th. is an Order to the Bishop to reprove an Abbot, or another Clerk, guilty of some Injustice.

The 35th. is a Confirmation of the Privileges of a Monastery.

The six first Forms of the Second Book, are Forms of a Donation, or abandoning of Goods to an Hospital, Monastery, or Church.

The 30th. is the Form of a private Separation between the Husband and the Wife.

The 39th. is a Form whereby two Persons give to a Church the Propriety of two Inheritances, belonging to each of them, upon condition, that they shall have the Use of them during their Life, and that the Survivor shall enjoy them both.

The 40th. is the Bishop's consenting to that Deed of Use.

The 42d. is a Form of a Letter of one Bishop to another, when he sends him * the *Eulogies* at *Easter*.

The 43d. is the Bishop's Answer upon the receiving of them.

The 44th. and 45th. are Forms of Letters of a Bishop to the King, or Queen, or to another Bishop, about *Christmas-Day*. Pieces of

The 46th, 47th, 48th, and 49th. are Forms of Commendatory Letters. The first to recommend one to a Bishop, the second to recommend him to an Abbot.

The 4th. is the Confirmation of an Exemption already granted.

Labbe is of *M. Bignon's* Mind, and pretends even to shew who that *Marculphus* is, because in the Life of St. *Austrogisilus*, Archbishop of *Bourges*, there is mention made of one *Marculphus* by Name, who was a Reader during the Life of St. *Austrogisilus*, and was afterwards Abbot of that Saint's Monastery, in the Suburbs of *Bourges*. What is said of *Marculphus* in that Place, happened in the time of *Ethobius* of *Lyons*, who was dead in 601. *Marculphus* might then be fifteen, or twenty Years old, he wrote his Forms being above seventy Years of Age, which come up to 560.

[* Some

Portions of the consecrated Bread, in Communion.]

March-
phus.

March-
phus.

114.
115.
116.
117.
118.
119.
120.
121.
122.
123.
124.
125.
126.
127.
128.
129.
130.
131.
132.
133.
134.
135.
136.
137.
138.
139.
140.
141.
142.
143.
144.
145.
146.
147.
148.
149.
150.
151.
152.
153.
154.
155.
156.
157.
158.
159.
160.
161.
162.
163.
164.
165.
166.
167.
168.
169.
170.
171.
172.
173.
174.
175.
176.
177.
178.
179.
180.
181.
182.
183.
184.
185.
186.
187.
188.
189.
190.
191.
192.
193.
194.
195.
196.
197.
198.
199.
200.

[(2) To go in Pilgrimage to the Tombs of St. Peter and St. Paul the Apostles.] Soon after that Peace was settled in the Church by Constantine, the first Christian Emperor, and sacred Learning and knowledge began to flourish, several inquisitive Persons, that they might gain a more lively and thorough Knowledge of the historical Parts of the Old and New Testament, travelled into the Holy Land, to see the Places so frequently spoken of in the Holy Scriptures, where most of the Matters were transacted. Upon which account it is that St. Jerome, who travelled thither for the same Reason, saith, that it is a Confirmation of our Faith to see the Ground on which Christ's Feet did tread. In Imitation of these Mens Practices did others travel to Jerusalem out of Devotion soon after, placing much Religion in visiting and worshipping the Places of Christ's bodily Presence. But the Fathers of these Ages sharply reproved this growing Superstition. Heaven (saith St. Jerome) is as near thee at home as at Jerusalem, and why wilt thou travel thither, as if Christ were only to be found there. Some make it a part of Religion (saith St. Cyril) to have been at Jerusalem, but Christ never commanded it, and what can justify us, to make that a Part of Religion which Christ doth not? All this did not yet so repress it, but after that Image and Saint-worship was brought into the Church, Pilgrimages to the Tombs of Saints and Martyrs became more frequent, and at length were imposed, and

encouraged as meritorious; and procuring Pardon of Sins. Innocent III. granted Pardon of all Sins, to all that went in Pilgrimage to the Holy Land; and Boniface VIII. to all that went to Rome to visit St. Peter and St. Paul's Tomb. Clement VI. granted these Pilgrims to Rome a Power to free the Souls of four of their Relations or Friends out of Purgatory, and gave Commandment to all the Angels in Heaven, to carry the Souls of such as dyed in Pilgrimage, to Heaven immediately. Thus Pilgrimages became a necessary Part of Religion; and became very gainful to the Popes and their Metropolis, were much encouraged and practised, till the Truth recovered strength again by the Reformation, and by enlightning Mens Minds, put out the superstitious Conceits of the Flames of Purgatory.]

Among the other ancient Forms of France, which Mr. Bignon hath published *, together with those of Marchepus, [* At Paris there are some more found concerning the Church, as the 11th. which is a Cession made to a Church; the 12th. which Octavo, is a Form of a commendatory Letter given to Clerks; the 13th. 26th, 27th, and 28th. which are Donations to Churches; Quarto. the 44th. which is a Form of Exemption given by the King to a Monastery of Virgins; the 45th. is a Confirmation of that Privilege.

Among those which are according to the Roman Law, there are Forms of Donation to a Church, N. 1, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38. And lastly, in the last Forms, published by M. Bignon there are also found Forms of Donations to Churches, and commendatory Letters of Clerks.

C O S M A of Jerusalem.

Cosma.

Cosma.

S Uidas saith, that in St. John Damascene's Time flourished Cosma of Jerusalem, a witty, ingenious Man, very skilful in making Hymns and spiritual Songs, elegantly and learnedly; and that they surpassed all that ever was done or shall be done in that kind. We have yet thirteen of those Hymns upon the principal Festivals of

the Year, which are so much the better, because the Sense of them is taken out of the Holy Scripture, and is nobly expressed. In Imitation of him one Mark made one upon Holy Saturday, and Theophanes another on the Annunciation of the Virgin.

P A N T A L E O.

Pantaleo.

Pantaleo.

T H E Name of Pantaleo, a Deacon, and afterwards Presbyter of the Church of Constantinople, is found at the Head of four Sermons. The first of the E-

[(as) A sermon upon the Exaltation of the Cross.] Altho' it be very uncertain whether this Sermon do belong to Pantaleo, tho' it bears his Name; yet it is probable that the Feast of the Exaltation of the Cross had been instituted some time before, by the Emperor Heraclius I. anno 630. and so 'tis likely enough such a Sermon might

be made upon this Feast, by this or some other Father of this Age and Time, as well as others; which were the common Subject of these Centuries.]

The first is in the Bibliotheca Patrum, printed at Cologne. The second was publish'd by Gretser, and the other two by Combefis, who durst not affirm them to be the same Author's. There is nothing remarkable in those Monuments. Possevin says, there were at Constantinople some Sermons of this Author for the whole Year.

St. JULIAN of Toledo.

Julian of Toledo.

Julian of Toledo.

S T. JULIAN, Disciple of Eugenius, chosen Archbishop of Toledo in the Year 680. was President in several Councils held in that City, and died in 690. His Successor Felix, having praised his Virtues, sets down the Catalogue of his Books. * He wrote, saith he, a Book of the Prognosticks of another Life, directed to the Bishop Idatius; in the beginning of which there is a Letter to that Bishop, and a Prayer. This Work is divided into three Books, the first is of the Original of Man's Death. The second of the State of the Souls of the Dead until the Resurrection. The third is of the last Resurrection. He made moreover a Book of Answers, dedicated to the same Person; in which he maintains the Canons and Laws, whereby Christian Slaves are forbidden to serve Infidels. We have also an Apology for the Faith, dedicated to Pope Benedict, and another Apology for three Articles, about which the Bishop of Rome seemed to have had some Doubts; a little Tract of the Remedies against Blasphemies, with a Letter to Adrian the Abbot; a Treatise of the Proof of the sixth Age, [or of the coming of Christ] at the beginning thereof there is a Letter to King Ervigius, with a Prayer. This Work is divided into three Books; the first contains the Texts of the Old Testament, shewing, without any need of supputation of Years, that the Messiah is come: The second Book shews, by the Apostle's Doctrine, that Christ came in the fulness of Time; The third proves, that the sixth Age, in which the Messiah was to come, is come; There he distinguisheth the five Ages which went before, not by the Years but by the Generations. We have moreover a Collection of his Poetry containing Hymns, Epitaphs and Epigrams in great number; a Book of Letters; a Collection of Sermons, among which is found a little Writing of the Protecti-

on of the House of God, and of those that retire into it; a Book intitled, Of the Contrarieties of the Scripture, divided into two Parts. The first whereof comprehends what relates to the Old Testament, and the second to the New; a Book of History of what happen'd in France in the Time of King Wamba; a Collection of Sentences, taken out of St. Augustine, upon the Psalms; some Extracts of the same Father's Books against Julian; a Treatise of Divine Judgments, taken out of the Scripture, with a Letter to King Ervigius; a Treatise against the Persecutors of those who fly into Churches; a Book of the Masses for the whole Year, divided into four Parts, in which he corrected some which were either corrupted or imperfect, and made new ones; a Book of Prayers for the Festivals of the Church of Toledo, either reformed or newly made.

Of all those Works these only remain:

The Treatise of the Prognosticks, directed to Idatius Bishop of Barcelona, with the Letter and the Prayer: The three Books, to shew the sixth Age against the Jews: And the History of the Acts of Wamba in France.

In the first Book of the Treatise of Prognosticks, he treats of Mens Death; he shews it is Sin that subjected them to Death, and affirms it is called *Mors a Mortu*, because the first Man became Mortal, by eating of the forbidden fruit. He believes, that, altho' Death be not good, yet it is useful to the Just, and that a sharp Death remits Sins. He examines why Baptism remitting Original Sin, does not free Men from the Law of Death; and he gives two Reasons for it, taken out of St. Augustine, and of Julian Pomerius. He believes Angels assist the Just at their Death, and that Devils do then be in wait for them. He commends the Piety of the Faithful, who take care to do the last Office to their

Julian of Toledo. their Parents; hereupon he produces some Passages out of *St. Augustine*, about the Sacrifices offered for the Dead, and the Suffrages of Martyrs.

In the Second, which is of the State of Souls after Death, he says, those of perfect Christians are immediately carried into a Paradise, where they remain, joyfully waiting for the Resurrection of their Bodies: And that they enjoy in that Place the Happiness and the Knowledge of God. He believes those of them who have some Sins to blot out, are detain'd for a while; but neither the one nor the other do enjoy as perfect a Vision of the Divine Substance, as they shall do after the Resurrection, tho' they do already see God; and reign with Christ: That the Wicked, immediately after Death, are precipitated into Hell, where they undergo endless Torments. He establisheth * *Purgatory*, which he believes to be a real Fire, wherewith Sins remaining at ones Death are expiated in the other World; and that the Time of the Souls abiding there is proportion'd to the number or the grievousness of Sins committed by them. He affirms, that the Souls of the Dead may know one another. He says, the Dead pray for the Living, but not for the Damned; that they know what is done here below; that they pity those they have been acquainted with; that they are earnestly desirous of Mens Salvation; that sometimes they appear to the Living; that the Damned see only some of the Blessed.

The third Book is of the Judgment and Resurrection: These are his Opinions. Neither the Time nor the Place of the Final Judgment can be known, nor how long it will last. Jesus Christ shall appear descending from Heaven with Angels, carrying his Cross: At the Sight of him the very Elect shall tremble for fear, and that Fear shall purify them from their Sins; but the ungodly shall be in a strange Confusion. All the Saints shall judge the World, together with Christ. All Men shall rise in a Moment, and shall put on again a true Body and Flesh, but incorruptible, without Defect, Imperfection or Mutilation, in a perfect Age and perfect Beauty. The difference of Sexes shall remain, but without Lust, without any need of Food or Raiment. All Children, who had any Life in their Mothers Womb, shall rise again. Angels shall separate the Good from the Bad; the Consciences of both shall be laid open, the ungodly shall be cast down head-long into real Fires, in which their Bodies shall burn without being consumed; there shall be different Torments, according to the Difference of Crimes; and the Children guilty of Original Sin only, shall suffer the easiest Pain of all; It is needless to ask where that Fire shall be; after the Condemnation the Recompence of the Just shall follow, and then the Heaven and the Earth shall be set on Fire; there will be a New Heaven and a New Earth, where the Saints may dwell,

tho' they may also ascend up into the Heavens; they shall then see God as the Angels do see him now; they shall enjoy a Liberty so much the more perfect, as they shall no more be obnoxious to Sin; they shall all be happy tho' in different Degrees of Happiness; they shall be wholly employ'd in praising God; they shall place all their Felicity in the perpetual Contemplation and Love of him. These are the Points of Doctrine which *Julian* gathereth from the Fathers of the Church, for properly this Work is nothing else but a Collection of Passages of the Fathers, chiefly of *St. Augustine*, *St. Gregory* and *Julian Pomerius*.

The Treatise against the Jews is more of *Julian's* Composition. He proves in the first Book, That the signs of the *Messias's* coming, pointed at in the Old Testament, are come to pass; That the Time set down by *Daniel* agrees with the coming of Christ; and that after *Jerusalem's* Destruction the Jews can expect no other *Messias*. In the second he shews, by the History of the New Testament, that Jesus Christ is the *Messias*, and that the Apostles did convince the Jews of it. In the last he distinguisheth the Ages of the World by the Generations, and shews we are in the sixth Age: The first is from *Adam* to the Flood; the second from the Flood to *Abraham*; the third from *Abraham* to *David*; the fourth from *David* until the carrying away into *Babylon*; the fifth from the carrying away into *Babylon* to Jesus Christ. He compares the Account of the Years of the *Hebrew* Text, and of the *Septuagint*, and prefers the latter, because it was more suitable to his Design, finding by this means 5000 Years run out from the Beginning of the World to Christ's Birth. He extols the Authority of the Version of the *Septuagint*, and affirms that the Jews have corrupted the *Hebrew* Text. He adds, That altho' it were not so, yet the distinction of the Generations shews the fifth Age of the World was run out when Christ came into the World.

The History of the Acts of *Wamba* in *Gallia*, being no Ecclesiastical Work, we will make no Extract of it here, contenting our selves in observing, that it is found in the first Volume of the *Historiographers of France*, put out by *Du Chesne*.

In the *Bibliotheca Patrum* of *Cologne* [in 1618.] they have attributed to *Julian of Toledo*, a Book of *Antilogies* * or [* at *Basil* seeming Contrarieties of the Scripture, which had been already printed without the Author's Name; but it was found to be *Berthorinus's*, Abbot of Mount *Cassin*. in 1535.]

There was also part of a Commentary upon the Prophet *Nabum* published under *Julian's* Name: But besides that, there is nothing said of it in *Felix's* Catalogue, the Style and the manner of the Writing of it, shew plainly enough it belongs to another Author, tho' bearing *Julian's* Name in the Manuscript upon which *Canisius* publish'd it.

THEODORUS of Canterbury.

Theodorus of Canterbury. **T**heodorus, bred a Monk of *Tarsus*, was ordained Bishop by Pope *Vitalian*, and sent in 668 into *England*, to govern the Church of *Canterbury*. He arrived there Two Years after his departure [staying long in *France* as he went] and was well entertained by King *Egbert*, who had sent to *Rome* to desire a Bishop to be sent to him. He laboured much in the establishing of the Faith and the Church-discipline in *England*. He held several Councils, made Bishops, founded Monasteries, made Peace between Princes, kept the People in their Duty; and having thus performed all the parts of a good Pastor, during the space of 20 years, he died in 690. being 88 years old.

He is the First that composed a Penitential among the *Latins*, made up of Canons, taken out of the Councils of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church. This Book was soon spread all over the West, and many undertook to make such like Works, which in process of time became very common and very bad, because every one making Collections of Canons, according to his Fancy; nay, and some inventing them, this kind of Works soon grew full of Absurdities, Contradictions and Errors, favouring Mens Lusts, and authorizing Looseness and Remissness in Discipline. We have not now *Theodorus's* Penitential whole and in its Purity. *M. Dacherius* published some Fragments of it; and since that *Mr. Petit* published part of it [at *Paris* in 1677.] under the name of *Theodorus's* Penitential; but he confesses in his Preface, 'tis not the whole Penitential of this Author; and it is credible, that this very part of it was altered, and mingled with several other Canons; for it is not

without Errors; *Theodorus* is cited there as a Third Person, and things are met with there contrary to *Theodorus* himself (a).

However, these are the Contents of the first Part, under Fourteen Titles or Chapters.

The First is of the Church. There it is forbidden to celebrate the Sacrifice in a place, where Infidels have been buried. It is declared, There ought to be no Steps to the Altars, where there be Relicks of Saints; that there ought to be a Lamp burning before them every Night, unless the Church be poor; That (bb) *Frankincense* is to be offered on the Festivals of Saints; that

it is not lawful for the Laity to recite the Lessons in the Church, nor to say *Allelujah*; but only to sing the *Psalms* and *Responses*, without *Allelujah*.

[(bb) *Frankincense*.] This Custom of burning Candles, and offering Incense to the Saints Images, was derived from the Heathen-Romans, who as *Polyd. Virgil* tells us, Solebant

ad Statuas, thus, & cereos ac. Pol. Virg. cendere, as *Cicero* speaks of the Images set up in Honour of *Caesar*. l. 2. c. 23. us *Marius*. This Ceremony did Pope *Leo III.* about the year *Cicer. Offic.* 794. bring into the Church; and commanded, That the Priests should burn Incense at the Altars of the Saints. So great Promoters of Superstition were the Bishops of *Rome* in those Ages, Bal. in vit. and so careful Nurses of it have they been ever since, that the same Custom is retained to this day in their Image-worship.]

The Second is of the Church's Rights: It shews, that the Bishop may confirm in the Fields; That the Presbyter may consecrate there; That the Bishop cannot force an

(a) **T**O *Theodorus himself*. 'Tis not so much a Penitential as a Ritual, composed of several Canons. In the 11th. Chap. it is said, Ergo unam licentiam dedit *Theodorus*; which shews it is a Compiler that speaks; and having set down a Canon of *Theodorus's*, draws a Conclusion from it. It cannot be said, 'tis *Theodorus* himself. He might well say, the Ancients prescribed such a time of Penance; but *Theodorus* did much re-

trench it. But after having made a Constitution, he would not say; Ergo *Theodorus*, &c. There are Errors in this Chapter contrary to the Constitutions he made in the Council of *Hereford*, which a recertainly his. What is said in the end, That there is no Reconciliation in his Country, because there is no publick Penance, does not agree to the Age *Theodorus* lived in, nor to the practice of his Church, and several Canons of his Penitential prove the contrary. Abbot

Theodorus of Canterbury. Abbot to come to the Synod; without a rational Cause; That the Bishop may judge poor Men's Causes; not exceeding fifty Pence; but if the Sum exceed that, the cognizance of it belongs to the King; That the Bishop may dispense with a Vow, if he judges it fit; That Presbyters only can say Mass, bless the People, and consecrate Crosse; That Presbyters are not bound to pay Tenths; That they ought not to discover their Bishop's Faults; That Men ought not to take the Sacrament from the hand of a Priest, that is not able to read the Lessons and to perform the Ceremonies; That the Presbyters, singing at the Mass, ought not to put off their *Chasuble*; That Persons Baptized by a Presbyter that is a Fornicator, ought to be re-baptized; That a Presbyter who had been ordained without being baptized, is to be baptized and re-ordained; and those are to be re-baptized that have been baptized by him (which is a very extraordinary Practice, and contrary to the use of the *Latin Church* of that time;) That Deacons are not to break the Bread of the Oblation, nor to say the Collect, nor the *Dominus Vobiscum*, nor the last Prayer; That they cannot impose Penance on a Layman, but they may baptize, bless Meat and Drink; That Monks also, and other Clerks, may bless Meat.

[A Cope used by the Priests and Deacons, at Celebrating Mass.]

The Third Title is of Ordinations. It shews, That in a Bishop's Ordination Mass is to be sung by the Bishop who performs the Ordination; and so likewise in the Ordination of Presbyters and Deacons; but for the Benediction of Monks, it is enough, That the Abbot say Mass; That the Monk is from that time to keep his Head covered with his Cowle during the space of seven days; That in the eighth, the Abbot shall take it away, as the Presbyter takes away the Veil of Persons newly baptized; That a Presbyter may consecrate an Abbess; but an Abbot ought to be consecrated by a Bishop; That the *Greeks* do bless the Virgins and Widows after the same manner, but the *Latins* do not give the Veil to Widows; That among the *Greeks*, a Presbyter may consecrate a Virgin, reconcile Penitents, consecrate the Oyl for Exorcisms, and the Chrism for the Sick, if need be; but at *Rome*, the Bishop only may do it.

The Fourth Title is of Baptism. It imports, that Baptism remits Sins; but according to Pope *Innocent*, it does not wash away the Stain of *Bigamy*, [or second Marriages]; That besides Baptism, Confirmation is necessary to Perfection; That he does not deny, but that Confirmation belongs to the Bishop; but yet that the Chrism was established in the *Nicene Council* (which is a false Supposition.) That the same Linen Clothes in which the Baptized are anointed, may be used many times; That the same Person who was Godfather at Baptism, may be Godfather at the Confirmation, but that it is not the Custom; That a Man un-baptized cannot be a Godfather; That a Man may stand Surety for a Girl, and a Woman for a Boy; That the Baptized may not eat with the *Gentiles*, much less with the *Gentiles*.

The fifth is of the Mass for the Dead. It imports, that among the *Latins*, the Monks use to carry the Corpse to Church, to anoint their Breast with the holy Chrism, to say Mass upon them, and then carry them out to the Grave, and to say a Prayer over them after they are interr'd, to say Masses for them the 1st, the 3^d, and the 30th day, and at the year's end, if they will; That for the Laity, they say Masses the 3^d, the 9th, and the 30th day; That they ought to fast 7 days for them; That Masses are not to be said for Children, unless they be 7 years old; That tho' *St. Denys* says, 'Tis a Blasphemy to pray for a wicked Man, yet *St. Austine* says, The Sacrifice is to be offered for all those that are dead in the Communion of the Church; That Presbyters and Deacons that will not, or ought not to communicate, are not to celebrate.

The Sixth Chapter is of Abbots, Monks and Monasteries. It is to this effect: The Abbot may withdraw himself with the Bishop's leave; the Abbot's Election belongs to the Monks; the Abbot cannot change his place, without the Bishop's consent, and without leaving a Priest in the Church, where he was, for the Ecclesiastical Ministry. Monks ought to have no Women with them, and Nuns to have no Men among them. A Monk cannot make a Vow without his Abbot's consent; if he make any, it is null. A Monk, chosen by his Society to be a Presbyter, ought not to leave his Rule; if he grows Proud, he shall be deposed, and become the last. It is at the liberty of Monasteries to receive infirm and weak Persons: It is also free for Monks to wash Laymen's Feet, unless it be on *Holy Thursday*. It does not belong to Monks, to impose Penances on the Laity.

The Seventh Chapter is of Womens Functions in the Church or Monastery. They are forbidden covering the Altar with the Corporal, laying the Oblations on the Chalice upon the Altar, standing among the Clerks in the Church, sitting at Meat with Presbyters, imposing Penance. But they are permitted to receive the Eucharist upon a black Veil, according to the use of the *Greeks*; they may make the Oblations (that is, the Loaves offered upon the Altar) but not according to the practice of the *Romans*.

The Eighth Chapter is of the Customs of the *Greeks* and *Latins*. These are observed there: On *Sunday*, the *Greeks* and the *Romans* do not ride on Horse-back nor in a Coach, unless it be to go to Church; they bake no Bread, and do not go to the Bath; the *Greeks* write no publick Acts; they both set their Slaves to work on *Sunday*. The *Greek* Monks have Servants waiting on them; the *Latin* have none. The *Latins* eat on *Christmas-Eve*, after having said Mass at the 9th Hour. The *Greeks* do all sup the Evening after the Mass. Both the *Greeks* and the *Latins* say, they ought to assist the Sick of the Plague. The *Greeks* do not give to Swine the Meat of strangled Beasts; the Skin, the Wool and the Horns of them may be taken. One may wash his Head and Feet on *Sunday*; but the *Romans* do not follow that Practice.

The Ninth Chapter is of the *Irish* and *Britains*, who differ from the Church about the keeping of *Easter* and their *Tonsure*. It is said there, that their Bishops shall be confirmed by the laying on of the hands of a Catholick Bishop; that the Chrism or the Eucharist cannot be given them, except they make Profession to re-unite themselves to the Church; and that those are to be baptized who doubt of their Baptism.

The Tenth is of those who are possessed with the Devil, or kill themselves. If they were godly Men, before they came to be possessed, they may be pray'd for; but if this Possession happened to them, after a Despair or some other Passion, they are not to be prayed for; Masses cannot be said for Self-murderers, but they may pray and give Alms for them: Nevertheless some say Mass for them that kill'd themselves, being out of their Wits, and having no use of their Reason.

The Eleventh contains many Questions about married Persons. It is said there, they ought to abstain from the use of Matrimony 3 days before the Communion, 40 days before *Easter*, 40 days before and after Child-bearing; That a Man may leave his Wife guilty of Adultery, and marry another; and that she may marry again after two Years Penance: But the Wife cannot leave her Husband, tho' an Adulteret; That a lawful (*) Marriage cannot be dissolved, but with the consent of both Parties; but either of them may give his consent, that the other withdraw into a Monastery, and then the other may marry again, if he had not been married again before. If a Husband is made a Slave, the Wife may marry at the year's end; That a Deacon's Wife, forsaken by him, is not permitted to marry; That a Man may marry within one Month after his Wife's death, and a Woman within one year after her Husband's Decease; that a Woman, that hath vowed Widowhood, cannot marry again; notwithstanding if she should marry again, it shall be free for the Husband to let her fulfil her Vow or not; That the Bishop may dispense with Vows; That it is free for one baptized to keep or put away his Wife, being a *Pagan*; If a Woman forsake her Husband, within five years after he may take another Wife. If she be carried away Captive, he may marry another, one year after; but if she cometh again, he shall leave this last; That it is lawful among the *Greeks* to marry in the Third Degree, and among the *Romans* in the Fifth only; but Marriages contracted by Persons within the Third or the Fourth degree of Consanguinity, are not dishonoured. Parents are bound to bellow their Daughter on him, to whom they have betrothed her, except she be unwilling. Children are in the Power of their Father, till they be 16 years old; but that time being past, they may enter into a Religious Order, and the Father cannot marry them against their Will. I leave out some other Constitutions less important; as also the 12th Chapter of Slaves, as being now out of date.

[(*) Marriage dissolved by the consent of both Parties, or of one to withdraw into a Monastery.] The great Veneration and Honour which the Fathers of these Ages had for a single and a Monastick Life, made them not only to have a mean Opinion of that sacred Institution of God, Marriage, but also approve of very slight Reasons of dissolving it. So apt are Men to make void the Law of God to maintain their own Traditions, whereas neither Cilebaey itself is absolutely necessary for a Monastick Life, many of the Monks in the more pure Ages being married; nor, if it were, could the consent of one or both Parties dissolve the Bonds of it upon that account, For what God hath so joined together, no Man can put asunder, unless it be for the only Cause allowed by God for Divorce, Adultery.]

The 13th Chapter is upon different Customs. It is observed therein, that there are Three Solemn Fasts in the Year, that is, besides the ordinary *Lent*, Forty Days before *Christmas*, and Forty Days after *Whitsunday*. It is said there, that the Laity are bound to perform their Vows; That Friars may not bear Arms; That one Child may be given in exchange for another to a Monastery; That the Church ought to pay Tribute, if it be the custom; That Tythes are to be given only to the Poor, and Strangers; That he that fasts for the Dead, does good to himself; but that God alone knows, how it goes with the Dead; That infirm Folks may eat and drink at any Hour.

Mat. 15. 6.

Athan. Ep. ad Drac.

Mat. 19. 6.

The 14th. Chapter is about the Reconciliation of Penitents. It imports, that the Romans do reconcile them, *intra absidem*, (that is to say, near the Altar, in the Place which is rail'd in,) but that the Greeks do not do so; that the Bishop only maketh the Reconciliation on *Holy-Thursday*; but if the Bishop cannot well do it, he may empower a Presbyter to do it. He adds, that in his Province there is no Reconciliation, because there is no publick Penance.

M. *Petit* hath joined to this Work some other Collections of Canons, bearing *Theodorus's* Name. The first might be intituled a Penitential, rather than that before mentioned. It is discoursed there first of all, what they ought to do who are enjoyn'd a Penance of one, two, or three Years Fasting. 2. What they may do to redeem those Penances, whether by reciting Psalms, or giving Money to the Poor; what Number of Psalms they ought to say, or what Sums they ought to bestow. 3. After what manner Penitents are to come before the Bishop to receive Penance. 4. Of the different Penances to be imposed for different Crimes. There one may see some Remainders of the ancient Penance. Penitents did come in the Beginning of *Lent* to the Door of the Metropolitan Church bare-footed, covered with Sackcloth, and did cast themselves on the Ground. The Arch-Priests, or the Ministers of Parishes, did receive them there, and enjoyned them Penances; then they brought them into the Church, they sung the seven Psalms, the Bishop laid

[(cc) *Holy Water.*] This Heathen Rite of sprinkling consecrated Water for the purging and purifying of Men, which may seem to have had its Original from the Jewish Law, which prescribes a Water made with the Ashes of an Heifer to purify the Unclean, by sprinkling them therewith, was so far from being used or approved by the Christians for many Ages, that they abhorred the Use of it as a diabolical Superstition. *Theodoret* commends a Fast of *Valentinian*, then Tribune, after Emperor, as most suitable to the Christian Practice; that going before the Emperor *Julian* the Apostate into the Temple of Fortune, the Priests sprinkled him as the rest of the Company with Holy Water, which when he espied upon his Garment, he immediately not only cut off that part where it was, but also smote the Priest with his Fist in Anger, saying, He was a Christian, and therefore was defiled, not cleansed by their Holy Water, which shews, that it was not then used among the Christians; but in this superstitious Age it crept into the Church among other Ceremonies, and is still in Use in the Roman Church, as a Purgative from Sin.]

The ten Capitules proposed to the Council of *Hereford* by *Theodorus*, related by *Beda*, do certainly belong to this Archbishop of *Canterbury*, tho' they be not taken out of his Penitential, but out of a Collection of Canons. It is decreed in the first, that *Easter* shall be kept the Sunday after the 14th. Moon in *March*. In the 2d. Bishops are forbidden to encroach upon the Bishopricks of their Brethren. In the 3d. They are forbidden to molest Monasteries, or to take their Goods from them. The 4th. is against those Friars who go from one Monastery to another, without their Abbot's Leave. The 5th. against the Clerks, who leave their Bishop. Other Bishops are forbidden to entertain them. The 6th. imports, that foreign Bishops and Clerks shall content themselves with the Hospitality used towards them, and shall not perform any Function of their Ministry, without Permission from the Bishop of the Place. The 7th. appoints Councils to be kept twice a Year. The 8th. forbids Bishops to prefer themselves before others out of Ambition, and

enjoins them to follow the Time and Order of their Ordination: The 9th. declares, that it is fit to encrease the Number of Bishops, according as Believers encrease in Number. The last prohibits unlawful Marriages. It forbids Husbands leaving their Wives, except for the Cause of Adultery; and orders those that shall leave them to remain unmarried. By this Decision it appears, that the former Collection is not wholly *Theodorus's*, because the 10th. Chapter contains Decisions contrary to this.

The Capitules published by M. *Dacherius*, in the 9th. Vol. of his *Spicilegium*, are the greatest part of them in M. *Petit's* first Collection: But this Collection is more faithful and genuine; for tho' some places thereof may be corrected by the Manuscripts of the first Collection, it must be confessed, that in this *Theodorus's* Canons are set down in the Order observed by *Theodorus*, and that they are not mixed with so many strange Canons. These are the most remarkable things contained in them. In the 12th. it is said, that among the Greeks, the Clergy and the Laity communicate every Sunday: But that among the Latins, it is left to Mens Liberty, to communicate or not; and that those that do not communicate, are not excommunicated for that. The 35th. is that famous Article of the Confession. It imports, That it is lawful, in case of necessity, to confess to God alone. *Gratian*, *Burchard*, and *Ivo Carnutensis*, do quote this Passage otherwise. *Theodorus* says in his Penitential, That some say, with the Greeks, Men ought to confess their Sins to God alone: Others believe, they ought to confess them to the Priests; and almost the whole Church is of that Mind: That Confession which is made to God blots out Sins, and that which is made to Men teaches us, how they are blotted out. God oftentimes does invisibly heal our Evils, and sometimes he uses the help of Physicians. This differs much from the very Words of *Theodorus's* Penitential, if they be faithfully related in F. *Dacherius's* Collection.

M. *Petit* hath also carefully gathered the Canons cited under *Theodorus's* Name, in a Collection of the Councils of Spain, in the Penitentials of *Egbert* of York, and of *Beda* in the Roman Penitential, and in that of *Rabanus*, by *Regino*, *Burchard*, *Ivo Carnutensis*, *Gratian*, and several other Collectors of Canons: But all those Authors have many false Quotations, and so their Authority is not much to be relied upon.

All this shews, that we have not the true Penitential of *Theodorus* in its Integrity and Purity; that what Mr. *Petit* published under the Title of a Penitential, is nothing less than that; that the Capitules, which he published also from a Manuscript, which M. *Faber* communicated to him, are not *Theodorus's* neither; and all the rest of his Collections are taken out of suspicious Monuments. Nevertheless, he is to be commended for his Diligence and Labour, and we are beholden to him, for having gathered together all that bore *Theodorus's* Name. *Spelman* found in Cambridge Library a great Penitential ascribed to *Theodorus*, of which he gives us the Titles. It is to be wished it were published, that we might see whether it be *Theodorus's* own Original, or another Collection of Canons.

M. *Petit* joined to *Theodorus's* Penitential, an old Compendium of Canons, a Collection of divers Monuments about Church Rites, and chiefly about Penance, taken out of several Manuscripts, and a Collection of several Papers, Constitutions, Bulls, Edicts, Declarations, Privileges, Letters, Confessions, and other Pieces, which he hath published. These Monuments are accompanied with two Dissertations, the one upon *Theodorus's* Pastoral Vigilancy, to shew, that all Bishops are bound not only to take care of their own Church, but moreover to watch over all the other, to help them in their Need; the other upon Penance in which he pretends to defend *Theodorus's* Opinion; and to prove against F. *Morinus*, that in the ancient Church, there was no Penance for secret Sins, tho' never so grievous. Yea, and he brings in Proofs, tending to shew, that there lay no Obligation to confess them to Men, nor to submit them to the Ministry of the Church Keys, and that inward Repentance was sufficient to obtain the Remission of them. Lastly, he adds some Notes upon his pretended Penitential, wherein he shews a great deal of Learning and Reading. These are the Contents of the two Volumes in Quarto printed at Paris by *Dezallier* 1679, under the Title of *Theodori Penitentiale*.

FRUCTUOSUS.

Fructuosus

F *Fructuosus*, the Founder of several Monasteries in Spain, translated from the Bishoprick of *Dumes* to the Archbishoprick of *Toledo*, by the Decree of the 10th. Council of that City, composed two Rules, the one for the Monastery of *Complutum*, and the other common

for all Monasteries, which is as a Supplement to the former, they are both found one after another in the second Part of the Rules of *Benedictus Anianus*, [Printed by *Holstenius* at Paris, 1663.]

Fructuosus

C E O L

CEOLFRIDE.

Ceolfride.
[* Then
Girvium.]

Ceolfride, Abbot of Jarrow in England, Beda's Tutor, wrote a Letter upon *Easter* to Naito King of the *Picts*, which his Disciple preserved us. He flourished toward the End of the 7th. Century, and

died in 720. In that Letter he treats of the several Sorts of the Clerks Tonsure, and of the Celebration of *Easter*, and confesseth those Differences are of small Consequence, and that they should not trouble the Peace.

ADELMUS.

Adelmus.

Adelmus, Abbot of Malmesbury in England, wrote also a Book concerning *Easter*, against the Custom of the *Britains*, and a Book of Virginity in Prose and Verse. We have yet this last Work. That in Prose was printed by *Sonnus* in 1576, and inserted in the *Bibl. Patrum*, that in Verse was published by *Canisius* in 1608. In this Tract he gives an Encomium of many Holy Persons, whose Life he describeth.

This Saint is believed to be he, who was Bishop of *Sherborn*, who had made a Book of Problems in Verse, in Imitation of *Symposium*, of about a thousand Verses. But *Sigebert*, who speaks of these two Authors, in two different Chapters, seems to distinguish them. One must not look for Politeness in the Works of this *Englsh* Man.

ADAMAN.

Adaman.
[* From
the Mouth
of Arculphus, as
Dr. Cave.]

Adaman Abbot of *Huy*, wrote a Treatise of the Places in the Holy Land, taken * out of the Memoirs of *Arculphus*, a French Bishop who had travelled into *Palestine*. He wrote also the Life of

St. *Columbus* his Predecessor. F. *Mabillon* hath published those two Tracts more entire and correct, [in *Sac. Bened. dict. III. p. 2.*]

APONIUS.

Aponius.

Altho' it be not precisely known in what time this Author lived, it is probable, he lived about the end of this 7th. Century. He made a Commentary upon the Song of Songs, in which what is said of the Bride and Bridegroom, he applied to Christ and his Church. We have six Books of that Work in the *Biblioth. Patr.* It is pretty well written, full of Wit and Learning,

and one of the best that was made upon that Subject. We have an Abridgment of the rest of that Commentary, made by a *Benedictine* Abbot: And *Angelomus*, who lived above 700 Years ago, copied out several Places of it in his Commentary upon the Song of Songs, [printed by it self at *Fribourg*, 1538.]

CRESCONIUS.

Cresconius.

Cresconius, an African Bishop, flourished towards the end of the 7th. Century. He made a Collection of Canons in two Parts. The first intituled, *An Abridgment of the Canon-Law*, contains the Titles pointing to the Matters, together with the Citation of the Canons where they are found. The second contains the Canons themselves, set down in their full Length, in the same Order that they are cited in the Abridgment. This is

intituled, *An Harmony of the Canons*, or, *A Book of Canons*. The Abridgment was published [at *Paris*] in 1588, by M. *Pittheus*, from a Manuscript of the Church of *Troyes*, and since that by M. *Altasarus* [at *Poitou*] in 1630, and by F. *Chifflet* in 1649. M. *Justel* and *Voellus* inserted it also with the whole Harmony, in their *Bibliotheca Juris Canonici*, [or, *A compleat Body of the Canon-Law*.]

JOANNES MONACHUS.

Monach.

NO Authors did ever carry the Virgin Mary's Praises farther, than the *Greeks* of these latter Ages. We have already spoken of eight Sermons of *George Pisides* upon that Subject. Here is a Monk, who is probably of the same time, not at all inferior to him in the Declamation, which he made upon the Birth of the Mother of God. He mingles with the Virgin's Commendations some Speeches, which he applies sometimes to St.

Anne, sometimes to the Virgin. He brings in the Patriarchs, the Prophets, and the Righteous. Yea, and *Adam* himself acts his Part there. If any Body liketh these kind of Discourses, he may consult the Originals; for we are not willing to make Extracts of them. *Allatus* thinks, this *John* was Archbishop of *Bulgaria*. It is not known when he lived.

DEMETRIUS CYZICENUS.

Demetrius
Cyzicenus.

WE have, under this Bishop's Name, a little Writing of the Original and Errors of the *Jacobites*, in which he says, that the Author of that Sect was a Monk of *Syria*, named *James*, surnamed *Tzantzale*, who had embraced *Eutyches's* Error, and *Dioscorus's* Party; that since the Council of *Chalcedon*, those among the *Syrians*, who sided with the Emperor, had been called *Melchites*, that is to say, Royalists, because * *Melchi* in *Syriack* signifieth a King; and those who followed *Eutyches's* Opinions, took the Name of *Jacobites*. That these acknowledge, there were two Natures in Christ before the Union, but they hold there is but one after the Union; and so they suppose either the Confusion, or the Mixture of the two Natures, and are condemned as *Theopaschite*, because they believe the Godhead did suffer; that they own the 3 first Synods only; that when they cross their Foreheads, they do it with one Finger only, to signify the Unity of Nature; that because of that they do not cross themselves from the right Hand to the left, as others do, but from the

left to the right; that they mingle the Oblation with Oil, and matter not much Communicating; that they put no Water into the Cup; that they care very little, whether they do worship Images, or not, and look upon that as an indifferent thing; that they eat Flesh in *Lent*; that they have their peculiar Offices, and have added these Words to the *Trisagion*, *Thou that art crucified for us*. There be some among them, who call themselves *Chatzizarys*. They worship Crosses, and put Nails into them, to signify that the Godhead suffered: But they differ from the true *Jacobites*, in that they own two Natures in Christ, and seem to fall into *Nestorius's* Error, by saying, that during the Passion there were two Persons in Christ, the one suffering, and the other beholding the Sufferings. They fast some Days before the time that they leave Eating Flesh. In *Lent* they eat Eggs, Milk, and Butter; they offered unleavened Bread; they put no Water into the Cup; they baptized their Crosses. I have made an exact Extract or Abridgment of that small Writing, because it contains some Particulars pretty remarkable.

It is not known when the Author of it lived. Yet in all Probability he is of the 7th. or 8th. Century. Upon what he says, that the *Jacobites* had their peculiar Offices, it may be observed, that in the *Biblioth. Patrum* there is an Order of the Prayers and Ceremonies of the

Baptism, and Mass, with some other Prayers for the Use of the *Syrian Jacobites*, which are said to have been prescribed by *Severus* the Patriarch; that Work is probably of the same time.

Memoirs of the Schism of the Armenians.

THE Author of these Memoirs relates the Origin of the Schism of the *Armenians*, how they embraced the Error of the *Eutychians*, the different Parties that rose up among them, the Councils

held among them, the Catholick and Heretick Bishops they had, and several other Particulars relating to them. The Author of these Memoirs belongs to the 8th. Century.

JOHANNES NICÆNUS's Memoirs upon Christ's Birth, directed to Zachary, a Christian of Armenia.

HIS Author handles this Question; Why the Festival of Christ's Birth is kept on the 25th. Day of December; tho' the Constitutions of St. James and the Apostles, appointed that Feast-day on January the 6th. upon which Day Christ's Baptism is celebrated. He pretends, that the Custom of keeping that Festival on the 6th. of January, came from this, that John Baptist's Disciples, seeing Christ baptized on that Day, and having heard, he was then 30 Years old, they imagined it was also his Birth-day; that St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, did write of it to Pope Julius, who grounded it upon some of Joseph's Memoirs, in which it was observed, that in the seventh Month of the Jews, in the Feast of Tabernacles, the Angel had appeared to the High-priest, and stricken him dumb, until that Elizabeth had brought forth a Son; having cast

up the Days and Months, he found that Christ's Birth-day fell on the 25th. of December, and established that Custom in Rome; that St. Basil was of the same Mind, and wrote to St. Gregory Nazianzen, to procure the Approbation of that Practice in the Council of Constantinople, but that many would not receive it; that Honorius the Emperor persuaded his Brother to follow the Use of Rome in that; that St. Chrysostome had approved it, and with St. Epiphanius had appointed Christmas to be kept on the 25th. of December; that afterwards, this was confirmed in a Synod held in Constantinople, which writ of it to all the Patriarchs, who did all embrace this Practice. Much might be said against this Historian's Observations, which are almost all false. But we must not seek for Exactness nor Truth in the Memoirs of these modern Greeks.

St. OWEN.

ADAMUS or DADO, vulgarly called St. Owen, who governed the Church of Rouen from the Year 646, until the Year 689. wrote the Life of St. Eligius, Bishop of Noyon, directed to Robert;

Bishop of Paris. He relates his Miracles And Life in the two first Books, and in the last, he reproveth his Actions rhetorically.

B E D E.

B E D E, surnamed the Venerable (a) was born in England in the Year * 672 [in the County Palatine of Durham, within the Precincts of the Monastery of Girwy] not far from [the place where now stands a little Village called] Jarrow, [which lies near the Mouth of the River Tyne.] At seven Years of Age his Relations presented him to St. Benedict of Biscop, then Abbot of the Monastery [of St. Peter] at Weremouth; and Founder [of that of St. Paul's] at Jarrow, [to be Educated and Instructed.] In these Monasteries, which were not above five Miles distant from each other, did he spend his whole Life under the Government [of St. Benedict, and after] of Ceolfride, who was the first Abbot of this latter. Being nineteen Years of Age he was ordain'd Deacon, and Eleven Years after Priest, by John [of Beverly] Bishop of + Haguetsade. He applyed himself closely to the study of Ecclesiastical and Profane Learning, and [by means of his exact skill in both the Greek and Latin Tongues] having read much, and made very large Collections (b) he composed a Great Number of Books upon all manner of Subjects, [which filled the World with so much wonder, that * William of Malmesbury says of him, 'That it was impossible for any Man to write so many, and so large Volumes in the narrow compass of Humane Life, had not God afforded him an extraordinary portion of his Divine Spirit and Wisdom.'] He was the most Eminent Person of his time [Celebrated so highly by all the Eminent Men of that Age for his Universal Knowledge and Learning, that many said of him, *Hominem in extremo Orbis angulo Natum Universum Orbem suo ingenio perstrinxisse*, That he was born in the furthest part of the World, but comprehended the whole World in his Understanding.] He had many Scholars, and [by his Example and Instruc-

tion] made all sort of Sciences to flourish in England. He died of an Inflammation of the Lungs, [on the 26th. of May] in the year 735, [which was his Climacterick, and was buried in the Monastery of Girwy. His Death is remarked by the Author of the Annals, *Utoniensis*, with this Epitaphium; † *Beda Sapiens Saxonum quiescit: This Year died Bede the Wise Saxon*. From hence his Bones were removed to Durham, and put in the same Chest or Coffin with St. Cuthbert's.] Some affirm, that he made a Voyage to Rome; [And indeed it cannot be denied, but that Sergius, who was then Pope, having some weighty Affairs of the Church then before him, did by his Letter sent to his Abbot Ceolfride; so earnestly request him to come to Rome, to determine some difficult Controversies and Questions then under debate, which he thought could not be determined without him, as if at this time Bede, not the Pope himself, had been the only Infallible Oracle upon Earth.] Yet it is certain, that he never went out of England, [or left his Monastery;] and it evidently appears by his Writings, that he was never at Rome (c). Bede's Works have been collected, and divided into eight Tomes, which were Printed at Basil by Hervagius in 1563, and at Cologne in 1612. [They had been Printed in three Tomes at Paris, in 1545, but not so Correct.] The two first Tomes contain such Works only, as concern Humane Arts and Sciences, viz. of Grammar, Arithmetick, Astronomy, Physick, Chronology, and Morality. Those which have nearest Relation to Ecclesiastical Matters are two Treatises about the Tropes and Figures of Holy Scripture, his Writings about the Lunar Cycles to find Easter-day every Year, and a Treatise of Times, in which he defends the Computation of the Years of the World according to the Hebrew Text against the Calculation of the Se-

(a) Surnamed the Venerable.] Upon what account he had this Name given him, is not known. Several Reasons are alledged, but the most probable is this, That those that read his Book while he was alive not daring to give him the Title of Saint, contented themselves to call him Venerable; Nevertheless we do not find, that he was called so by any Contemporary with him. He is also called Saint, Blessed, English Doctor, the Most Illustrious Master and Reader by way of Excellence.

(b) Having Read and Collected much.] As long as he lived he never gave over Reading, Writing, and Teaching.

(c) It appears by his Writings, that he never was at Rome.] He never speaks of this pretended Voyage to Italy, but when he mentions the Pope's Letters, which he hath inserted in his History. He says, he had them from Nothelmus a London Minister, who brought him them from London. In his Letter to Egbert, speaking of the Customs used at Rome, he doth not alledge his own practice for Confirmation of them, but refers us to the testimony of Egbert. He tells us, that he understood by some Monks that had been at Rome, that they put the date of the Year from the Passion of Jesus Christ upon their Christmas Tapers.

venty and divides the duration of the World into Six Ages, of which he gives us the History and Chronology in a small Treatise by it self, [which hath also been Printed alone at Paris in 1507, 4to. and with the Scholiast of J. Bronchorstius at Cologne in 1537.]

The third Tome contains his Historical Books. The first, and most considerable is his *Ecclesiastical History of England*, divided into five Books. The first contains the most remarkable things that happened in *Great Britain*, from *Cæsar* to the Death of *St. Gregory*, [Anno 604.] The other four relate at large what passed in the Church of England from that time [to the Year 731.] At the end he hath annexed an Abridgment of this History in the form of a Chronicle, to which are joyned the Lives of *St. Cuthbert*, Arch-Bishop of *York*; *St. Felix*, Bishop of *Nola*; the Bishop of *Arras*; *St. Columbanus*; the Abbot *St. Vedastus*; *St. Arzalas*, the Abbot; *St. Patrick*, the Apostle of *Great Britain*; *St. Edistatus*, Scholar of *St. Columbanus*; *St. Bertolfus*, Abbot of *Bobio*; *St. Arnolphus*, Bishop of *Metz*; and *St. Burgondofora*, an Abbess; with a Relation of the Travels and Martyrdom of *St. Justin* a Youth, in Verse, who was beheaded at the *Louvre* in the time of *Dioclesian's* Persecution.

The Life of *St. Patrick* is not *Bede's*, but *Probus's*, of *St. Columbanus*, *Jonas's*, and of *St. Arnoldus*, *Paul* the Deacon's

The Martyrology of *Bede*, as we now have it, is not in the same Purity, in which he composed it, but several things have been added since, as is usual in Works of that Nature. *Bollandus* and his Followers do likewise assert, That it is not of *Bede's* Writing, but *Florus's* a Deacon of *Lyons*, under whose Name 'tis found in several Manuscripts.

The Treatise of Holy Places is made up of several large Relations, and particularly from those of *Arculphus*, a Bishop of *Frante*, written in three Books by *Adamannus*.

To this small Tract is annexed a large Collection of Hebrew Names both Proper, and Appellative, and others, put in an Alphabetical Order, and explained.

This Tome ends with a Book, intituled, *Collections taken out of the Fathers, containing Sentences, Questions, and Parables*. This Treatise is a Miscellaneous Rhapsody, without either Order or Method, and unworthy of the Name of *Bede*.

The fourth Tome of *Bede's* Works, contains his Commentaries upon some part of the Books of the Old Testament, of which the Catalogue followeth.

An Explication of the three first Chapters of *Genesis*, taken out of *St. Basil*, *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Augustine*.

A Literal and Allegorical Commentary upon all the *Pentateuch*.

Four Books containing an Allegorical Explication of the Books of *Samuel*, i. e. of the First and Second Books of the *Kings*.

Thirty Questions upon the Books of *Kings*.

Three Books of Allegorical Explications of the two Books of *Esdras*.

A short Allegorical Exposition of the History of *Tobit*.

An Allegorical Exposition of the Book of *Job*, divided into three Books. This Work is not *Bede's*, but some other Author's; and he himself cites it in his Book of * Ounces under the Name of *Philip* of *Syda*.

A Commentary upon the Proverbs of *Solomon*, in three Books.

Seven Books upon the *Canticles*. The first contains an Extract of *St. Augustine's* Books against *Julian*, a Summary of all the Chapters applying them to the Church, and the Text of the *Canticles*. The five following Books contain a Commentary upon the Text taken out of the Ancient Commentaries. The last is made up of Collections of passages out of *St. Gregory* upon the *Canticles*.

This Tome concludes with three Books, wherein he explains Allegorically the Relation, which *Moses* gives in *Exodus* of the Building of the Ark, the Tabernacle, and Priests Garments. *Trithemius* makes mention of a Commentary of *Bede* upon the *Proverbs*, and he himself speaks of another upon *Ecclesiastes*; but these Works are not published, no more than his Explication of all the Prophets.

The fifth Tome contains his Commentaries upon the New Testament, viz.

Four Books upon the Gospel of *St. Matthew*.

Four Books upon *St. Mark*.

Six Books upon *St. Luke*.

A long Comment upon the *Acts of the Apostles*, at the end of which is a small Treatise of the Names, Places, and Cities, spoken of in that History.

A Commentary upon the Catholick Epistles. [*Bede* made a Preface to this Commentary, giving an Account of the

Order and Inscription of those Epistles; but it never was Printed with his other Works; but being lately found in a M.S. belonging to *Cains College* in *Cambridge*, it hath been printed in *Dr. Cave's Historia Literaria* among *Bede's* Works.]

A Commentary upon the Revelation.

The Commentaries upon all *Saint Paul's* Epistles, which are taken out of *Saint Augustine's* Works, are reserved for the Sixth Tome. There are several Opinions about the Author of this Commentary. Some attribute it to *Perer*, an Abbot of the Province of *Tripolis*, others to *Florus*, a Deacon of *Lyons*, and others continue it to *Bede*. It is certain, that all these three did make Comments upon these Epistles, taken out of *St. Augustine*. *Cassiodorus* assures us of the first, *Wandelbert* of the second, and *Bede* says it of himself in the Catalogue of his Works at the end of his *Church-History of England*; and after him *Hincmarus*, and *Lupus Ferrariensis* testify the same to us. But to which of these they ought to be attributed, it would be hard to know, unless it were discovered by the Ancient M.S.S. (a), in which this Commentary, printed under the name of *Bede*, is attributed to *Florus*; and where we find the true Commentary of *Bede*, bearing his own Name, as *F. Mabillon* hath observed in the first Tome of his *Analecæ*.

This Tome contains also some Retractions and Additions, to some places of his Commentary upon the *Acts*; Six new Questions, and the Translation of *St. Chrysostom's* Sermons in praise of *St. Paul*, made by *Anianus*.

The Seventh Tome contains 33 Homilies fitted for the Summer. 32 for the Summer-Festivals of the Saints. 15 for the Winter. 22 for *Lent*. 16 for the Winter-Festivals of the Saints, and several Sermons attributed to *Bede*.

Common places upon several Moral Points taken out of the Holy Scripture and Fathers.

An Allegorical Treatise of the Valiant Woman, by which he understands the Church.

A small Tract of the Offices of the Church, and some Fragments of an Allegorical Exposition upon the *Proverbs*.

The Eighth Tome contains divers Treatises omitted in the former Tomes.

An Allegorical Explication of the Temple of *Solomon*, with reference to the Church, of which it was a Figure.

Another Exposition upon the three first Chapters of *Genesis*. Several Questions upon *Genesis* with Answers to them, taken out of *St. Ambrose*, *St. Augustine*, *St. Isidore*, but more especially out of *St. Jerome*.

The same sort of Questions upon *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, *Numbers*, *Deuteronomy*, the Books of *Joshua*, *Judges*, and *Kings*. Divers Questions upon the Scripture.

A Commentary upon all the Psalms.

A small Treatise upon these words of Psalm the 52. *The Lord looked down from Heaven to see, if there were any upon Earth that would understand, and seek after God.*

Some Notes upon *Boethius's* Treatise about the Trinity.

Meditations [upon the Passion of Christ] for the seven hours of the day.

Bede's Penitential, intituled, *Remedies against Sin*.

Dacherius hath printed in the Tenth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, a Martyrology, which sets down in Heroick Verses the chief Festivals of the Saints through the Year. It bears *Bede's* Name, and the Author was certainly an Englishman, a Monk of the Monastery of *Farrow*, and Contemporary with *Bede*; and indeed is much like the Style and Genius of this Author.

There were also published in *England* in the year 1664, some Letters of *Bede*; Together with the Lives of the Abbots of *Weremouth* and *Farrow*: *F. Mabillon* in his first Tome of his *Analecæ* hath published a short Letter of *Bede* to *Albinus*, but it contains nothing remarkable in it.

Besides the Works afore-mentioned, there hath been lately published out of the Ancient MSS. by the Reverend and Learned Mr. *Henry Wharton*, Arch-Deacon of *Canterbury*, a Commentary of *Bede* upon the first One and Twenty Chapters of *Genesis*; His Exposition of the Song of the Prophet *Habakkuk*; as also two Epistles, the one containing an Apology for himself against such as accused him of some Erroneous Opinions, the other to *Egbert*, Arch-Bishop of *York*, together with a more correct Edition of his History of the Lives of the Abbots of *Weremouth* and *Girwy*. Printed at *London*, in 1693.

Bede's Style is clear and easy, but is neither Pure, Elegant, Lusty, nor Polite. He wrote with wonderful readiness, but without Art or Consideration. He had much Reading and Learning, but wanted Judgment and Critical

under the name of *Florus*. In some MSS. it carries the name of *Bede* and *Florus*. Lastly, *Florus* made another Commentary upon *St. Paul* taken out of the Works of 12 other Fathers, without any mention of *St. Augustine*, which proves that he had already collected the Testimonies of this Father in another Work.

[* Derati-
one Uncia-
rum.]

(a) BY the Ancient MSS. F. Mabillon quotes two MSS. of 800 years old, wherein he finds under the Name of *Bede* a clear different Commentary from that which is printed under his Name. This bears the Name of *Florus* in the Ancient MS. of *Corbey*. It carries the same name in the MS. used by *Trithemius*, and in another quoted by *F. Mabillon*. In an Ancient MS. Collection of Canons this Collection is cited also

Bede. Exactness. He collected indifferently all he found, without Picking and Chooing. His Commentaries upon Holy Scripture; as we have observed, are nothing but Extracts of the Commentaries of the Fathers, collected and put together by him. He had set down the Authors out of which he took every passage, by putting into the Margin the first Letter of their Names; but by the Negligence of such as

Bede. copied them, they are lost. His History is exact enough as to the things that passed in his time, or a little time before him, but as to the other parts of it we cannot safely credit it, because he often made use of false Memoirs. His Compositures upon the Prophane Sciences, are neither very deep, nor exact, but they are well enough done for his Age.

JOHN, Patriarch of Constantinople; and AGATHO, Deacon of the same Church.

John and Agatho. AFTER the Death of the Emperor *Constantine* [commonly called *Pogonatus*] his Son *Justinian* [the Second of that Name] a Cruel Man obtained the Empire in 685, and was deprived of it in the tenth year of his Reign by *Leontius Patricius*, who cut off his Nose, and banished him; but he was soon after depoled by *Apismarus Tiberius*: And at length *Justinian* was again restored in 705, but was at last slain in *Bithynia*, Anno 712. by the Command of *Bardanes*, surnamed *Philippicus*, who invaded the Empire. This Man who had been the Scholar of the Abbot *Stephen*, the Scholar of *Macarius*, caused the Picture of the Sixth Council to be pulled down, the Names of *Sergius*, and *Honorius* to be put in the Dyparchs, and the Acts of the Council, which were in his Palace to be burnt. He persecuted the Orthodox Bishops, banished *Cyrus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, put *John* in his place, and endeavoured to reverse the Definitions of the Sixth Council, and revive the Doctrine of the *Monothelites*. But he did not live long enough to perfect his design, for he was taken, and had his Eyes put out by certain Persons that conspired against him in 713, on the Saturday before *Whitsunday*, and the next Day *Fl. Anthemius* was declared Emperor, surnamed *Anastasius*, and crowned by *John*. He published the Sixth Council anew, put up the Picture of it, and caused the Acts to be written out again

by the Deacon *Agatho*, who relates this whole matter in a Memoir, which he hath put at the end of the Acts of the Council.

John, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, declared that he was of the same Opinion, and to reconcile himself to the Western Church, he wrote a Letter to Pope *Constantine*, in which he excuses himself for not sending a Synodical Letter of Communion, because he was hindered by the violence of *Philippicus*. He then gives him an Account how he was raised to the Patriarchate; He says, that *Philippicus* had a design to put into it a Person, who was not of the Clergy, and who was of his own Sentiments, but he was forced by the earnest Petitions of the Clergy of *Constantinople* to choose him; That he never had declared himself to be of the Erroneous Opinion of the Emperor, nor did write to the Pope in defence of them; but he owns, That he was forced to dissemble the Truth by using ambiguous terms; He endeavours to excuse his behaviour, plainly acknowledges two Natural Wills in Jesus Christ, and approves of the Council held under *Martin I.* and the Sixth Council. Lastly, He earnestly desired the Pope to receive him into his Communion, and to write his Synodical Letters to him, without regard to what had passed. Nevertheless *Constantine* gave him no Answer, and he was likewise depoled a little after, and *Germanus* put in his place.

GERMANUS, Patriarch of Constantinople.

Germanus, etc. *Germanus* Bishop of *Cyzicum* was translated to the Patriarchal See of *Constantinople*, Anno 713. and enjoyed it till 730, when he was deposed by the Emperor *Leo Isaurus*, and sent into Banishment in which he died. We have three of his Letters in the Acts of the Seventh Council. Some attribute also to him a Mystical Work about the Ceremonies of the Liturgy, intituled *Theoria*, printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, which contains also an Explication upon the Lord's Prayer, which is printed by it self. Four Sermons upon the Virgin printed by *F. Combefis* in Greek and Latin in his Addition to the *Biblioth. Patrum*. The first is upon her Presentation in the Temple. The second, which is upon her Annunciation, is a Dialogue between the Angel, *Mary*, and *Joseph*; and the two last are upon the Death of the Virgin, in one of which he insinuates, that she was taken up into Heaven in her Body. *Schottus* hath published another Sermon upon the Nativity of the Virgin, under the Name of *Germanus*; but *F. Combefis* hath restored it to *Andreas Cretensis*. Some also believe, and not without Reason, that the Book, intituled *Theoria*, and his Homilies, of which we have spoken already, belong to another *Germanus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who lived in the twelfth Age under *Alexius Comnenus*, and in the time of Pope *Gregory* the IX, to whom he wrote a Letter. *Gretzer* hath also published two Sermons upon the Cross, which are this latter's rather than the former's; as also the Sermon upon the Virgin's Girdle put out by *Surius*. Lastly, *F. Combefis* hath published in Greek and Latin, a long Discourse about the Burial of Our Lord, which *Gretzer* attributes to the Author of the two Homilies upon the Cross; but it seems to be better written, and to be-

long to a more ancient Author. We find also a Fragment taken out of a Treatise of Synods, and Heresies, directed to *Antimus* the Deacon, which seems also to be a good Piece. But the Work that doth most certainly belong to the elder *German* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, is that which *Photius* gives us some Extracts of, [in his *Biblioth. cod.* 233.] intituled, * *Of a lawful Retaliation*, in which he defends *St. Gregory Nyssen* from the Errors of *Origen*, which some imputed to him. He shews, that they, who were of *Origen's* Opinion concerning the ending of Hell-Torments, have imputed this Error to *St. Gregory Nyssen* by altering some of his Expressions, putting an ill Construction upon others, and not rightly understanding his other Writings. *Photius* observes, that his Style in this Work is clear, and easie; that he makes a fit use of Figures; that his Phrases are elegant, and polite; that he is not flat, and troublesome; that he keeps close to his Subject, and doth not fly from it by impertinent Expressions, forgetting nothing necessary for his Subject, and solidly proves the Propositions asserted; that he chiefly confutes the Error of those who imagine, That the Devils and Damned Souls shall one day be estates among the Blessed, having constantly suffered [for their Sins.] He confutes, I say, this Opinion by the Authority of Jesus Christ, his Apostles, the Prophets, and Testimonies of the Fathers, particularly by some Passages taken out of the Works of *St. Gregory Nyssen*. He answers to the Testimonies of this Father, which the *Origenists* alledged, and shews their Cheats, discovers the Places that they have added, and vindicates him against all the Accusations of his Enemies.

BONIFACE of Mentz.

Boniface of Mentz. Boniface was an English man by Nation, and was called properly *Winfred*, or *Winfred*; he professed a Religious Life in England, and at the same time applied himself close to his Study, that he might make himself serviceable to the Church. With this intention he went out of England in the year 715, to preach the Gospel in *Frisland*, but the War forced him to return into England. Not long after he went to *Rome*, from whence he was sent by *Gregory* the Second to preach the Gospel in Germany, Anno 719. He preached first in *Turingia*, and then in *Hassia*, *East-Frisland*, and *Saxony*. Having planted the Faith of Jesus Christ in those Provinces, and converted several thousand Souls, he made a second Journey to *Rome*, and was there consecrated Bishop in 723 by *Gregory* the Second, who

sent him back again with Instructions, and Letters of Recommendation. Being returned, he continued to preach the Gospel in *Turingia*, *Hassia*, and *Bavaria*. He received the Pall from *Gregory* the Third, with an allowance to constitute Bishopricks in the Countries newly converted. The Respect which he had for the Holy See, made him undertake a third Voyage to *Rome*, but he stayed not long, but returned soon into Germany. It was then his main business to establish a firm Custom in the Churches which he had planted, to reform Discipline and Manners, to abolish Superstitions, to erect Episcopal Sees where it was necessary, and to hold Councils, of which he summoned several in Germany and France. Hitherto *Boniface* had only the Quality and Dignity of a Bishop and Vicar of the Holy See, with-

out any particular Title: Wherefore *Pepin*, and the great Lords of *France*, thought it convenient to give him one, designing to make him Bishop of *Cologne*; but the See of *Mentz* becoming vacant by the Deposition of *Gervoldus*, *Boniface* was put into his Place, and that Church made a Metropolis, which was confirmed by Pope *Zachary*, who made five Bishops Sees subject to it, viz. *Tongres*, *Cologne*, *Wormes*, *Spire*, and *Utrecht*; and the Bishopricks newly erected, or those that depended upon *Worms*, viz. *Strasburg*, *Ausburg*, *Wurtemberg*, *Buraburg*, *Erford*, *Eichstat*, *Constance*, and *Cöira*. But he soon after laid down that Dignity upon the account of *Lullus* his Scholar, whom he put in his Place with the Consent of *Pepin*, the Bishops, Clergy, and Lords of the Province, having first obtained Leave of the Pope to do it. He went to *Utrecht* to preach the Gospel in *Frisland*, where he was barbarously murder'd by the Heathens, *June 5. An. 754.* in the Place, whither he was come to confirm a great multitude of Persons newly baptized, and was buried in the Abby of *Fulda*; *Serarius* hath published a Collection of *Boniface's* Letters, together with *Lullus's*, *Adalmus's*, and several other of his Scholars, Friends, Princes, and Popes, that wrote to him. [At *Mentz* in 1605, Reprinted 1629.]

The first is to one of his Friends, called *Nithardus*; in it he takes the Name of *Winfrid*, which shews, that it was written when he was young. He exhorts this Friend to contemn Temporal Things, and apply himself to the Study of Holy Scripture, that he may acquire (saith he) that Divine Wisdom, which is more glittering than Gold, finer than Silver, more sparkling than Diamonds, more rare than Precious Stones; and he adds, That there is nothing that he can search after in his Youth with greater Honour, or possess with greater Comfort and Pleasure in his Age, than the Knowledge of Holy Scripture.

The second is directed to an Abbess, to comfort her in her Afflictions.

The third is superscribed to the Bishop *Daniel*. In it he complains of the Behaviour of certain Clergymen, who taught Errors, and permitted Persons guilty of Murder and Adultery to be admitted into the Priesthood. And that which troubled him most, was this; That he could not wholly separate from them, because they were in great Reputation in *Pepin's* Court, of whom he stood in need: But he says, That he did avoid all Communion with them in the Holy Mysteries. He observes, That the Opposition which he met with from Heathens and Infidels was the more tolerable, because it was without; but when a Priest, Deacon, or Clergy-man, departs from the Faith, this causes a Disorder in the inward parts of the Church. He asks Advice of this Bishop, how he should carry himself; he says, that on the one hand he is obliged to hold a fair Correspondence with the *French King's* Court, because he cannot, without his Authority and Command, defend the *German Churches*, and subdue the Idolatry of those Provinces. That going to desire Orders for that end, he cannot but communicate with those disorderly Clergy-men; yet he is afraid that he offends God by it, having promised by an Oath to Pope *Gregory* to avoid those Persons; but on the other side, he is afraid of bringing a greater Damage upon the Church, if he should forbear going to the *French King's* Court. He adds, that he seems to satisfy his Oath by separating from those irregular Clergymen in their Ministry, and not agreeing with them in their Errors, or sinful Conversation. We have *Daniel's* Answer to this Letter, wherein he approves of *Boniface's* Carriage.

The fourth Letter was written by St. *Boniface* when he was but a Deacon. It was to desire *Adelmus's* Books of *Alanus*.

The fifth is a Letter written by two of St. *Boniface's* Scholars to an Abbess.

The sixth is a Circular Letter of St. *Boniface* to all Christians, in which he exhorts them to pray to God for a Blessing upon his Travels for the Conversion of the Gentiles.

In the seventh, he desires an Abbess to help him by her Prayers.

In the eighth, he gives *Egbert* Bishop of *York* notice, that he hath sent a Writing to *Ethelwald* King of the *Mercians* against some Errors, and exhorts him to oppose them. He tells him, that he had sent him some of St. *Gregory's* Letters, which he hath taken out of the Library of the Church of *Rome*, and which he thought not common in *England*. He desires of him some of *Bede's* Works.

He requests the same thing in the following Letter to the Abbot *Huetbert*, and recommends himself to his Prayers.

In the 10th. he exhorts in his own Name, and in the Name of the eight Bishops that were with him, the Priest *Herefrede* to shew the Memoir which they sent him to the King of the *Mercians*, and exhorts him to follow their Advice. 'Twas to hinder the Debaucheries and Disorders of his Kingdom.

In the 11th. Letter, he consults the Bishop *Pethelmus* about the Customs of *France* and *Italy*, by which it was forbidden to marry her to whose Child he had been Godfather:

Whereupon he says, that till then he thought there was no harm in it, having never found, that it was forbidden by the Canons or Decrees of the Holy Bishops. He desires him to let him know, whether he hath met with any thing about it in any Ecclesiastical Writings.

The 12th. to King *Ethelbald* contains nothing remarkable.

The 13th, 14th, and 16th are directed to the Abbess *Eathburg*; in them he recommends himself to her Prayers.

In the 15th. to *Noshelmus* Bishop of *Canterbury*, he prays him to hold the same Friendship and Correspondence with him, which he had with his Predecessor *Berthwald*. He earnestly requests him to send him a Copy of St. *Austine's* Questions to St. *Gregory*, and this Pope's Answers, in which he allows Kindred in the third Degree to marry. He desires him to examine carefully, whether these Answers be St. *Gregory's*, because they are not in the Library of the *Roman Church*. He asks his Opinion about a Person who had married a Widow, to whose Daughter he had been Godfather, and prays him to tell him, if he had met with any Decree about it in the Canons, or Holy Fathers. Lastly, he desires him to tell him, in what Year of Jesus Christ the Persons, whom St. *Gregory* sent to preach the Gospel in *England*, arrived there.

The 17th. is sent to certain Monks, who had lost their Abbot. In it he names another to them, and gives them several Directions about a Monastick Life. He also nominates a Priest, and a Deacon, who should have the Care of Divine Service, and preach the Word of God to the Brotherhood.

The 18th. contains some special Tokens of Christian Friendship and Love to the Archdeacon, to whom it is written.

The 19th. is a Letter sent in the Name of *Boniface*, and five other Bishops, to *Ethelbald*, or *Ethelwald*, King of the *Mercians*. Having commended this Prince for his Virtues, particularly for his Liberality to the Poor, and his Justice; they tell him with a great deal of Freedom, that they have heard, that he lives in Incontinence, and shew him the enormous Nature of that Crime. They reprove him also for depriving certain Monasteries of their Privileges and Revenues, and account it worthy of the Name of the great Sin of Sacrilege. They complain also, that his Magistrates and Justices imposed Taxes upon the Monks and Clergy; they say, that the Churches of *England* had enjoyed their Privileges from the Coming of *Austine*, to the Reign of *Chelred* King of the *Mercians*, and *Ofred* King of the *Bernicians*; that these

[* Of Northumberland two Kings had committed very great Sins in abusing and wronging the Monks, and destroying their Monasteries, but had been punished for their Impiety, and died most miserably. They exhort him not to follow their Example, and in the Conclusion, lay before his Eyes the Shortness of this Life, and the Torments which attend Sinners in another.]

The 20th. Letter is to an Abbess, who had laid down the Government of her Nunnery, that she might live a more peaceable and quiet Life. She had desired his Advice, whether she should undertake a Journey to *Rome*. He doth not dissuade her from it, but advises her to stay, till the Disturbances in *Italy* were over.

In the 21st. he writes to the Abbess *Eathburg* the Visions which a certain Person had seen, who thought, that his Soul was separated from his Body for a time. He imagined himself to be taken up into Heaven, and from thence to behold evidently all that passed in this World, and in the other; to hear the Angels and Devils disputing about the State of the Souls, which were come out of the World; that the Sins which they had committed, stood up to accuse them, but the few Virtues, which they had practised, appeared in their Defence; that he had seen Pits of Fire, in the Bottom of which were the Souls condemned to eternal Flames, and at the Mouths were those, who should one Day be delivered from their Punishments; that he had seen Paradise, and the way that the Souls of just Men go thither, when they depart out of the World; that some fall into a River of Fire, as they pass, which thoroughly purges them, who have smaller Sins to expiate: Lastly, that he saw the Storms which the Devils raised upon Earth, and the Sins into which they plunged Men.

The following Letters of *Boniface* are Letters of Compliment, Thanks, or private Matters.

The 32d. is a Letter of Recommendation written by *Charles Martel*, [Comptroller of the Household to *Chilperick* King of *France*, and Father of *Pepin* the next King.] in Favour of *Boniface*.

The next are several Letters written to *Boniface*, or *Adelm*.

The 44th. is a Letter of *Adelm* to * King *Gerantius*, against some particular Customs in *Ireland*, concerning the shaving of Clergymen, and the Celebration of Easter.

After this come several Letters written by *Lullus*, the Boniface Scholar of St. *Boniface*; who succeeded him, and by other of *Mentz*. *Englishmen*.

In the 62d. *Lullus* ordains a Week of Abstinence, and two Days of Fasting, to obtain fair Weather.

The 70th. is a Letter of *Cuthbert* Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and his Synod; written to *Lullus*, and to the Christians of *Germany*, after the Death of *Boniface*. In it he shews the respect they had for the Memory of *Boniface*, and assures him, that they determine to celebrate his Festival, and take him for their Patron with St. *Gregory* and St. *Austine*, the Apostle of *England*. They exhort the Bishops of *Germany* to discharge their Ministry with Vigilance and Sanctity, and pray them to offer the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass for them, promising to do the same on their part.

In the 87th. *Magingok* Bishop of *Wurtemberg*, consults *Lullus* about the inseparable Conjunction made by Marriage, and observes the different Opinions of the Fathers about it.

The 91st. is *Boniface's*, and is directed to Pope *Stephen*. He desires him to continue the same Friendship and Protection to him, which his Predecessors had granted him; he promises for his part to continue his Labours, and always bear the same respect for the Holy See. He submits to his Judgment and Correction all that he hath said or done; he excuses himself, that he had not written to him so long, because he had been busy in repairing the Churches, which the barbarous People had pillaged and burnt.

The 92d. is also *Boniface's*, it is directed to *Fulredus* a Priest, to be presented to King *Pepin*, as a Petition from *Boniface*, that after his Death he would yield his Protection to his Scholars, and the Churches erected by him, and settle *Lullus* in his place to preach the Gospel to the Infidels, and govern the Churches.

The three next are but short Notes written to *Lullus*.

The 96th. is King *Pepin's* Letter to him, wherein he tells him, that every Bishop should often and devoutly repeat the Litanies without Fasting, to give God Thanks for the Plenty he hath given them.

The 97th. is a Letter written by *Boniface* to Pope *Stephen*, in which he consults him about the Contest between the Bishop of *Utrecht* and the Bishop of *Cologne*. St. * *Wilbrod* was ordained Bishop by Pope *Sergius*, and appointed to preach the Gospel in *Frisia*, where having converted many, he erected his See at *Utrecht* by the Order of *Carloman*; but the Bishop of *Cologne* contended, that that City belonged to his Bishoprick, because from the time of *Dagobert*, that Cattle had been annexed to the Bishoprick of *Cologne*, upon the account of preaching the Gospel to the *Frisians*. He adds, that this Bishop having not performed the Condition, he had forfeited his Right, and that this City ought to be a Bishop's Seat dependant upon the Holy See. He prays him to tell him what he ought to do, and send him a Copy of *Sergius's* Letter, that he might convince the Bishop of *Cologne*.

The 100th. Letter is *Lullus's*, who wrote to the Pope against the Priest *Enredus*, who would not be subject to his Jurisdiction.

The 105th. is *Boniface's*, wherein he imparts to *Cuthbert*

Archbishop of *Canterbury* the Canons made in his Synod. He tells him, that they made a Confession of the Faith of the Church, owned an Union, and Subjection to the Roman Church, would yield Obedience to St. *Peter* and his Vicar, and that they have ordained, that Synods should be called every Year; that they should require the Falls for Metropolitans of the Holy See; that they would follow the Commands of St. *Peter*; that Metropolitans, who have received the Fall, should observe the Behaviour of the Bishops; that Bishops should neither keep hunting-Dogs, nor Hawks; that the Priests should visit all their Charge in *Lent*, and give the Bishop an Account of their Conversation; that Bishops should visit their Diocess every Year; that Clergymen should not wear Laymens Habit, nor bear Arms; that Metropolitans should judge their Suffragan Bishops in their Synod; and the Bishops shall bring to this Synod all Persons, which they cannot reform, who shall be subject to their Metropolitans, and they to the Bishop of *Rome*. The remaining part of it is an Exhortation to Metropolitans to discharge the Functions of their Ministry with Vigilance, and die rather than do any thing contrary to the sacred Laws of the Church. About the End, he tells *Cuthbert*, that it were convenient to restrain the Women, and Virgins of *England* from going in such Numbers to *Rome*, because the greatest part of them were debauched, and caused great Scandal in the whole Church; for there is scarce a City, saith he, in *Lombardy* or *France*, where there are not some *English* Women of a wicked Life.

The 108th. Letter is a Copy of those Letters, which a Bishop used to send to the Religious Persons of his Diocess to recommend the Dead to their Prayers.

The 107th, 115th, and 117th. Letters are Petitions to the Emperors to oppose Swearing, and to desire some Favour.

The last is in the Name of the Church of *Mentz*, which desired her Bishop.

The following Letters are no part of this Collection, being Letters of the Popes to *Boniface*, and the Acts of the Council of *Rome* against *Adelbert*, held under Pope *Zachary*, of which we shall speak in another Place.

The Style of *Boniface's* Letters is harsh, and barbarous, but they are good Sense. He was very well acquainted with the Rules of Church-Discipline, he was wholly devoted to the Holy See, he had much Sincerity, and an ardent Zeal for the Reformation of Manners, especially of the Clergy, and for the Conversion of Infidels. Some attribute to him the Life of St. *Livinus*, which F. *Mabillon* thinks to belong to a more ancient Author. His Treatise of the Unity of the Faith is not come to us. F. *Dacherius* hath published in the 10th Volume of his *Spicilegium*, a Piece, intituled, *The Statutes of Boniface of Mentz*, which contains several Rules for managing the Functions and Life of Priests, with a Catalogue of the Festivals; but this Book cannot be the Treatise of the Unity of Faith, as some have affirmed: And there is some Ground to doubt whether it really belongs to *Boniface of Mentz*; and so much the more, because he there addresseth himself to the Emperor, whereas in *Boniface's* time there was no Emperor in *Germany*.

G R E G O R Y II.

Gregory II. *Gregory* the second of that Name was raised to the See of *Rome* the 24th. Day of *May*, in the Year 714. and governed that Church 16 Years, eight Months, and some Days. We have several of this Pope's Letters.

The 1st. dated in 718, is directed to *Boniface* the Priest, to whom he gave permission to preach the Faith among the Infidels of *Germany*. To this is annexed the Form of the Oath, which *Boniface* swore to the Pope at his Ordination in the Year 722. or 723.

The 2d. Letter is addressed to *Charles Martel*, Comptroller of the King's Household, to recommend *Boniface* to him. Upon which this Prince granted him Letters of Protection, which are among *Gregory's*.

The 3d. is also a Letter of Recommendation for *Boniface*, directed to all Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Lords, Earls, and in general to all Christians.

The 4th. is to the People, over whom he was constituted Bishop. 'Tis in the ordinary Form which is in the *Diurnus*.

The 5th. is directed to the great Lords of that Country.

The 6th. is to all People.

The 7th. is to the whole Nation of the *East-Saxons* inhabiting *Germany*.

The 8th. which bears Date 725. is directed to *Boniface*, to congratulate the Progress he had made in converting the Infidels.

The 9th, 11th, and 12th. respect the Controversie about Images, and are set down in the Acts of the 7th. Council, where we shall have a fit Opportunity to speak of them.

The 10th. is addressed to *Ursus* Duke of *Venice*, whom he exhorts to joyn himself with the Exarch in recovering the City of *Ravenna* from the *Lombards*, and putting it un-

der the Government of the Emperors *Leo* and *Constantine* again.

The 13th. is a Decretal Epistle, in which he answers several Questions put to him by *Boniface*.

In the 1st. Article about the Degrees of Consanguinity, within which it is forbidden to marry, he says, that it were to be hoped that no Persons nearly related would contract Marriage, but to yield a little to the Barbarity of that Nation, they must content themselves to prohibit Marriages between Persons related in the fourth Degree.

In the 2d. he permits an Husband, whose Wife is unable to perform conjugal Duties, to marry another.

In the 3d. he orders, that a Priest accused of any great Crime, shall clear himself by Oath, if there be no Witnesses for him.

In the 4th. he forbids, that Confirmation performed by a Bishop shall be repeated.

The 5th. commands, that there shall be only one Chalice set upon the Altar at the Celebration of Mass.

In the 6th. he uses St. *Paul's* Words to resolve the Question, *Whether it be lawful to eat Meats offered unto Idols?*

In the 7th. he declares, that it is not lawful for Children, whose Kindred have put them into the Monasteries before the Age of 14 Years, to go out of them to lead a secular Life.

In the 8th. he forbids to re-baptize those, who have been once baptized in the Name of the Trinity, altho' it were by wicked Priests.

In the 9th. he will have those Children baptized, of whom there is no clear Proof, that they have ever been so already.

In the 10th. he orders, that Lepers shall not be deprived of Communion.

Gregory II. In the 11th. he forbids flying, when the Plague, or any other contagious Disease is in a Monastery, or in the Church. In the last, he commands *Boniface* to reprove disorderly Priests and Bishops, but would not have him to refuse to talk, or eat with them.

This Letter is quoted by *Gratian* under the Name of *Gregory*, but it is *Gregory II.*, and 'twas dated the 10th. Year of the Emperor *Leo*, the 10th. Indiction, which is *Anno 726* of the Vulgar Æra, or common Account.

The 14th. Letter of this Pope is directed to *Serenus* Bishop of *Aquileia*, and in it he exhorts him not to invade the Rights of the Patriarch of *Grado*.

In the last to this Patriarch he tells him, what a strict Prohibition he had laid upon the Bishop of *Aquileia*.

Besides these Letters we have a Memoir, which this Pope gave to the Bishop *Martinian*, the Priest *George*, and the Sub-Deacon *Dorotheus*, whom he sent into *Bavaria*, in which he gives them Instructions, what they should do in that Country for the Establishment of the Churches, for the Ordinations of Bishops, and Regulation of Discipline. He advises them to allow of those Bishops who hold the Faith of the Church, and have been canonically ordained; to permit them to celebrate Divine Service according to the Roman Way; but to put out those, whose Faith is suspected,

or Ordination faulty; to model the Divine Service according to the Usage of the Church of *Rome*; to constitute in the Provinces a sufficient Number of Bishops, with an Archbishop; to set Bounds to Provinces and Dioceses; to enjoin the Bishops not to ordain such as have been twice married, nor ignorant, nor lame Men, nor such as have done publick Penance, nor Slaves, nor Servants, nor *Africans*; to have a special Care of the Church's Revenues, and divide them into four Parts, one for himself, another for the Clergy, a third for the Poor and Strangers, and a fourth for the Building; to ordain only in the Ember-weeks; to administer Baptism at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide* only, unless in case of Necessity; to observe the Constitutions of the Church of *Rome*; not to suffer any Man to have more Wives than one, nor to marry his Niece; to esteem Virginitie more highly than Marriage; to account no Meats unclean, but such as are offered to Idols; to avoid all sorts of Superstition; to teach, that it is not lawful to fast upon *Sunday*, nor upon *Christmas*, *Epiphany*, nor *Ascension-Days*; not to receive the Offerings of such as are at Enmity, till they are reconciled; to do Penance for daily Faults; to instruct the People concerning a Resurrection and a Judgment. This Memoir is dated *Anno 715*. [This Pope's Epistles are extant in the Councils, *Tom. 6. P. 1437*.]

G R E G O R Y III.

Gregory III. *Gregory* the third of that Name, was chosen in the Year 731. and sat 10 Years and some Months in the See of *Rome*. His first Letter is directed to *Boniface*, who was ordained Bishop of the *Germans* by his Predecessor. He granted him the Right of bearing the Pall, promises him to erect new Bishopricks in *Germany*, according as the Number of Christians shall multiply. He assures him, that he had not absolved a certain Priest who bragged, that he had received Absolution from him; and answers some Questions, which *Boniface* had propounded to him.

In the 1st. Article he orders, that they shall be baptized again in the Name of the Trinity, who have been baptized by the Heathens.

In the 2d. he forbids to eat the Flesh of a wild Horse.

In the 3d. he commands to offer the Sacrifice for all that died in the Orthodox Faith.

The 4th. ordains, that those who have been baptized by a Priest that hath sacrificed to *Jupiter*, or eaten Meats offered to Idols, shall be re-baptized.

The 5th. forbids Marriage to the seventh Generation.

The 6th. bids him to hinder a Widower to marry above twice.

The 7th. imposeth Penance for their whole Life upon such as murder their Father, their Mother, their Brother, or their Sister, and prescribes them for Penance to abstain from Wine, and Flesh-meats, and to fast three Days in the Week.

The 8th. forbids to sell Slaves to the Heathens.

The 9th. enjoins him, when he ordains a Bishop to summon two or three Bishops to be present at the Ordination.

The 2d. is a Letter of Recommendation directed to all

Bishops; Priests and Abbots, given to *Boniface* when he returned into *Germany*.

The 3d. is a Letter composed on purpose for the same Person, directed to the *Germans*, whom he commands to obey *Boniface*, and leave their heathenish Ceremonies.

The 4th. is directed to the Bishops of *Bavaria* and *Germany*, whom he enjoins to come to those Councils, which *Boniface* shall call.

The 5th. is directed to *Charles Martel*, of whom he desires Assistance against the *Lombards*. 'Tis very urgent, and yet withal very submissive.

The 6th. is to the same Person about the same Business.

The 7th. is to *Boniface*, he approves of the Division which he had made of *Bavaria* into four Bishopricks. He tells him that he ought to ordain those Priests, who have exercised their Ministry in that Country, Bishops, altho' he can't find out by whom they were ordained, if they be orthodox, and of good Conversation. He will not have such Persons to be re-baptized, who have been baptized already in the Name of the Trinity, altho' thro' Error the Words were not well pronounced, but orders them to be contented to confirm them by Imposition of Hands, and by anointing with the Chrism. He allows him to reprove and correct *Wilo*, if he act contrary to the Discipline of the Church. He orders him to call a Council, and not to continue long in one Place, but to travel for the Conversion of all the Country. This Letter is dated *Octob. 27. Indiction 8.* which is the year 739 of the Vulgar Æra.

To these Letters is joyned a Collection of Canons, taken out of the *Penitentials*, which seems to be a later Composition, than of *Gregory III.* and which I do not believe to be the Works of this Pope; [yet both are printed together under his Name in the Councils, *Tom. 6. Pag. 1468*.]

Z A C H A R Y Bishop of Rome.

Zachary. *Pope Zachary* was raised to the Holy See in the Year 741. He was a *Greek*, if we may believe the Authors of the Popes Lives, and had the Reputation of being most mild and courteous, and yet at the same time very valiant and courageous. At the beginning of his Popedom, *Italy* was in great Troubles, *Luitprandus*, King of the *Lombards*, being at War with *Thrasimond* Duke of *Spoleum*, and the *Romans*, who assisted the latter. *Zachary* made Peace between the *Romans*, and the King of the *Lombards*, upon condition that he should restore four Cities, which he had taken from them; and so poor *Thrasimond* being forsaken, was forced to give over his Opposition. But the *Lombard* having obtained his Design, was not careful to perform his Promise, but *Zachary* went to him, obliged him to restore the Cities to the *Romans*, and make a Peace with him. This very Pope being consulted by the *French*, whether they should acknowledge *Pepin* for their King, who had all the Authority already, and was enstated in the Government of the Realm, or *Chilperic*, who indeed had the Name of King, but was not capable of a Business of that Weight; answered in favour of *Pepin*, of whose Protection the *Romans* and Popes had then great need, having so potent an Enemy near at hand, as the King of the *Lombards* was.

Altho' these Matters were of very great Consequence, yet those, which are spoken of most in *Zachary's* Letters, concern the Churches newly founded in *Germany* by *Boniface*, who consulted him with much Respect.

V o L. II.

The first is an Answer to this Bishop's Questions; contained in the foregoing Letter: They both begin with Compliments. *Boniface* tells the Pope, how great Veneration he had for the Holy See; and the Pope assures him, that he was extremely glad at the Receipt of his Letters, by which he was informed, that the Church of Jesus Christ was every day increased by his Preaching. *Boniface* tells him, that he had ordained three Bishops in *Germany*, and divided the Province into three Dioceses; that he had placed one Bishop in the Castle of *Wurtemberg*, another in the City of *Buraburg*, and the third at *Erford*. He prays him to confirm what he had done, and to make these three Places into Bishop Sees.

Zachary returns an Answer to this Article, that he approved what *Boniface* had done, and did accordingly make those three Places Bishopricks. Nevertheless he desires him to see, whether these Places are considerable enough to place Bishops in, because the Canons forbid to place them in Villages or small Towns, lest the Dignity of Bishops be thereby rendered vile and contemptible.

Boniface, in the second Article of his Letter, informs *Zachary*, that *Carloman*, a *French* Duke, had desired him to hold a Council in his Kingdom, to restore the Discipline, which was almost lost because there had not been a Synod held in *France* for above fourscore years; and the Bishopricks and Archbishopricks by that means were fallen into the hands of Laymen, whose Lives were very scandalous, and disorderly. He desires leave of *Zachary* to hold a Council, and this Pope grants him his Request in his Answer.

In

Zachary. In the third Article he desires to know what he should do with those Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who lived in many Disorders and Debaucheries. *Zachary* answers him; that he ought not to suffer them to perform the Functions and Offices that belong to their Orders and Degrees.

In the 4th. Article, *Boniface* desires the Pope to appoint him a Successor, or give him leave to chuse one. The Pope denieth him this Request, it being contrary to the Canons to appoint a Successor to a Bishop while he is alive: Yet he grants him power to nominate one at the point of Death.

In the 5th. he enquireth, whether it be true, that one of his Country had obtained a Dispensation from [Gregory III.] *Zachary's* Predecessor, to marry his Uncle's Widow, which had been his Cozen-German's Wife, and had received the Veil. The Pope answers him, that his Predecessor did not grant such a Licence, because the Holy See allows nothing contrary to the Constitutions of the Councils, and the Holy Fathers.

In the 6th. he asks him, whether it be true, That on *New-Years Day* Heathenish Dances and Ceremonies are practised in *Rome*. The Pope answers, That there is no more any such practice there, and that that detestable custom was abolished by St. Gregory.

In the 7th. he says, that some *French* Bishops, who had been Adulterers or Fornicators, after they had made a Journey to *Rome*, pretended, that the Pope had given them Power to perform their Offices; but he maintained the contrary, because the Holy See would do nothing against the Canons. The Pope confirms him in this Opinion, and commands him not to believe them, but to punish them according to the Severity of the Canons. He adds, that he hath sent three Letters of Confirmation to the three Bishops constituted by *Boniface*; and also that he hath written to *Carloman*, to exhort him to a speedy Execution of his design. This Letter is dated on the 11th. Indiction, that is, in the Year 742.

The second Letter of *Zachary* is a Copy of the Letter written to the three Bishops instituted by *Boniface*. By the Authority of the Holy See he confirms the Institution of their Sees. He declares, that no body but the Apostolick Vicar, shall ordain Bishops for those Sees; and prohibits encroaching upon their Jurisdiction or Territory.

The third Letter of *Zachary* is that which he sent to the *French* Bishops, to congratulate them for endeavouring the re-establishment of Church-Discipline, and the Reformation of the Manners of the Clergy and to exhort them to do it effectually, and as becomes Holy Bishops.

By the 4th. Letter directed to *Boniface*, *Zachary* gives the *Pall* to the three Metropolitans instituted by *Boniface*; Then he approves the Sentence which *Boniface* had passed against two *French* Men who had lived a Profane and Disorderly Life. This Letter is dated in *June*, in the 12th. Indiction, that is, in the Year 743.

In the next Letter, directed to the same Person, he wonders, that *Boniface* having at first desired of him the *Pall* for the three Metropolitans, he begg'd it then but for one. He complains, that he suspected him guilty of Simony. He commends him for giving no credit to a Bishop of *Bavaria*, who did falsely affirm himself to have been ordained by the Pope. He exhorts him to hinder all them that do not live according to the Canons, from performing the Priestly Functions. He confirms him in the Right, granted him by his Predecessor, to preach in *Bavaria*. This Letter is dated in the year 745.

In the 6th. Letter, directed also to *Boniface*, *Zachary* answers a Question propounded to him by * two Persons of Piety of *Bavaria*, about the Validity of Baptism, Administered by a Priest, who not understanding Latin, instead of saying, *In Nomine Patris, Filii, & Spiritus Sancti*, had said, *In Nomina Patria, & Filia, & Spiritu Sancta*. *Zachary* answers, that if that Priest did not design to introduce an Error or Heresie, but committed this fault merely out of Ignorance of the Latin Tongue, they ought not re-baptize those whom he hath baptized, but only consecrate them by the Imposition of Hands.

The 7th. Letter to *Pepin* Constable of *France*, and to the *French* Bishops or Lords, is only a Collection of several Ancient Canons, touching divers Articles of Discipline, about which he had been consulted by *Ardobanius* a Presbyter sent from *Pepin*.

In the 8th. Letter he acquaints *Boniface*, that he hath sent those Canons, and enjoins him to examine a new the Matter of the three *French* Bishops, and to send them to *Rome*, in case they maintain their own Innocency. This is dated in *January* in the Year 747.

The 9th. Letter, according to the date, was sent the Year before. *Zachary* commends *Boniface's* Zeal, exhorts him to continue in it, comforts him concerning the Irruption of the Barbarians into the Countries converted by him. He approves what he had done in the Synod held in *France*, and was mightily pleased that they had pitched upon a City to be made a *Metropolis*, that *Boniface* might be settled there. He blames them that opposed this design, and commends the *French* Princes for having countenanced it. He con-

firms his Sentence against disorderly Bishops. He assures him, that he ought not to believe those that boast of being established by the Holy See. He acquaints him, that the Condemnation of *Adalbert* and *Clement* was approved in a Synod held at *Rome*. He saith, he will deal with another Seducer, named *Geolebius* who was in his Journey to *Rome*, as he deserves. He will have him to hold yearly a Council in *France*. He confirms him in the Right of a Metropolitan, which he annexeth to the City of *Cologne*.

The 10th. Letter is directed to *Boniface*. He says that they ought to re-baptize those who have not been baptized in the Name of the three Persons of the Trinity; That sacrilegious, Impure, or Heretical Priests or Deacons are to be banished into Monasteries, and put to Penance. He rejects the Error of one * *Sampson* a Presbyter of *Scotland*; affirming, that a Man might be made a Christian, without being baptized in the Name of the Trinity, only by the Bishops Imposition of Hands. He approves a Writing of *Boniface*, about the Unity of the Faith, and the Apostolick Doctrine, directed to all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. He refuses to send another Person to hold Councils in *France*; He approves also the Profession of Faith, sent to him by the *French* Bishops. He writes against *Virgilius*, who molested *Boniface*, assuring him, That he will write to the Duke of *Bavaria*, to send him to him, that he may judge him. Lastly, He answers *Boniface's* last Letter, that seeing the *French* did not keep their Promise, to make *Cologne* a *Metropolis* in respect to him, he may dwell at *Mentz*, and gives him leave to chuse a fit Person to succeed him. This Letter is dated *May*, 748.

The 11th. Letter of *Zachary* is directed to some *French* and *Germ* Bishops; He congratulates their Union among themselves and with the Holy See, and exhorts them to continue their labour for the Church, joyning with *Boniface*, Vicar of the Holy See.

The 12th Letter is to *Boniface*. He commends his Zeal and Piety. He likes well his Separation from the Erring and Disorderly Bishops. He says, that if the *French* Bishops will receive the *Pall*, and perform their Promises, they will deserve Praise; That what he received freely, he gives freely. He grants a Privilege to the Monastery of the *Benedictines* founded by *Boniface* in a Solitude of *Germany*. Then he answers several Questions proposed to him in a *Memoir*, which *Lullus*, sent by *Boniface*, presented to him. This is the Sum of these Answers. 1. That it is Unlawful to eat Wild Beasts, yea Hares. 2. That on the *Thursday* before *Easter*, when the Holy Chrism is consecrated, they ought to kindle three great Lamps full of Oyl, which may last till *Holy Saturday*, and to kindle at those Lamps the Paschal Tapers, used at the Baptismal Fonts. 3. That those that have the Falling-sickness, if they have it from their Birth, or from their Parents, should be banished from the Towns; but if it happens to them accidentally, they ought to endeavour to cure them; That in the mean while they are not to communicate, but after all the rest of the Congregation. 4. He approves the usage of Washing one anothers Feet on *Holy Thursday* before *Easter*. 5. He reproves some certain Fornis of Blessings used among the *French*. 6. He says, it were to be wished, that Presbyters were 30 Years old [before their Ordination,] yet, if need be, they may be ordained at 25. 7. He informs him, that *Milo*, who had been put in *Rigobert's* place at *Rheims*, should do well to quit that Bishoprick. 8. He says, That he hath found no Decree about the time in which they ought to eat Beacon; yet he does not think, that they ought to eat it before it be dried in the Smoke, or dressed at the Fire, and if they will eat of it without Dressing, they must stay still after *Easter*. 9. He approves the Condemnation of a Bishop who bore Arms, and committed Fornications. 10. He says, That Ordinations ought to be celebrated at Lawful times: Yet he excuses *Boniface* for performing them at other times out of Zeal. 11. He informs him, That he ought not to make any Scruple of taking a Penny a House for the Church Revenues. 12. He enjoins him to put to Penance, and to depose those Presbyters, who have been ordained, being only Laicks, and involved in Criminal Matters, if their Crime comes afterward to be discovered. 13. He thinks one may fly to avoid Persecution, when it is fierce. 14. He forbids Communicating with an Excommunicated Person who desires not Absolution. 15. He thinks that a Tribute may be taken of the *Sclavonians* who come to live in Christian Countries. 16. Lastly, He tells him, that he hath marked in *Lullus's* Volume, in what places they are to make the sign of the Cross in the Canon of the Mass. This Letter is dated *November* 758.

In the 13th. Letter, written a few days after, he praiseth the unwearied labour of *Boniface*, who had for 25 years together, preached the Gospel in *Germany*, and holden Councils in *France*. He says, it is just he should have a Cathedral Church; and for that purpose, he confirms the Right of Metropolitan to him and his Successors in the Church of *Mentz*, and gives him for Suffragans the Bishops of *Tongres*, *Cologne*, *Worms*, *Spire*, *Utrecht*, and all the Countries of *Germany*.

Zachary. The 14th. Letter of Zachary is the Privilege granted * to the Monastery of Fulda, founded by Boniface, which imports, that this Monastery shall be subject to the Holy See only; and that no Person shall say Mass, or exercise any Jurisdiction there, unless invited by the Abbot.

There is also a Letter of Boniface to Grifphon, Pepin's Brother, wherein he recommends to him some Monks of Turingia, to protect them against the Pagans.

The 15th. Letter of Zachary is directed to the Bishops of France. He sent it by some Monks, or Clerks, who were sent by Optatus Abbot of Mount Cassin, and from Caroloman, to procure Peace between Grifphon and Pepin, and to demand a second time St. Benedict's Body, which they pretended had been stolen away from Mount Cassin. He

exhorts the French Bishops to maintain the Justice of their Demand.

In the 16th. he exhorts the French to suffer no Ecclesiastical Person guilty of Murder or Fornication; and advises them to assemble Councils every Year, to restore the Discipline.

The 17th. Letter is supposititious, at least the Title and Date of it are false; for it is directed to Austrebert Bishop of Vienna, and there was no Archbishop of that Name in that Church under Zachary's Pontificate; and it is dated the 7th. of March, of the first Year of Constantine, which is the Year 741, of the Vulgar Æra; at which time Zachary was not Pope.

The 18th. is not more certain: 'Tis a Prohibition somewhat ill written, that a certain Person should not marry his Father's God-Daughter, because of the Spiritual Consanguinity.

[These Epistles are all of them extant in Tom. 8. of the Councils, p. 1498.]

ANDREAS CRETENSIS.

Andreas Cretensis. **A**NDREW, born at Damascus having finished his first Course of Studies in his own Country, came to * Jerusalem towards the year 730, where he embraced a Monastick Life, and was at the 6th. Council in his Patriarch Theodorus's stead, and there encountered the Monothelites. He was detained at Constantinople, and put among the Clergy of that Church; he was ordained Deacon, and had the care of the Education of Orphans committed to him. A little after, he was ordained Archbishop of Crete; he governed this Church many years, and died at Mitilene, in the beginning of the eighth Century of the Church.

He composed a great number of Sermons, and particularly Panegyrics. Father Combefis collected all that he could meet with in the Libraries, and printed them in Greek and Latin [at Paris] in 1644. [With Notes, and an Index to explain the Words.] This Collection contains 17 of them.

The first is upon the Virgin's Nativity: He extols this Festival, which he looks upon as the Original and Principal of all the Feasts of the New-Law. He there speaks of Joachim and Anne, of the Presentation of the Virgin in the Temple.

The 2d. is upon the Annunciation. In it he maketh several Divine Reflections upon the Angel's words.

The 3d. is on the Circumcision, and upon St. Basil. He follows Africanus's Opinion about Joseph's Ancestors; and says, he was Jacob's Natural Son, and Heli's according to the Law. He speaks of the Names of Immanuel and Jesus; and makes some Mystical and Moral Observations upon the 8th. Day. Then he passes to the Praises of St. Basil, in the end whereof, he maketh an excellent Prayer to him.

The 4th. is upon our Lord's Transfiguration. It contains several Allegorical Reflections upon the Circumstances of this Miracle.

The 5th. is an Homily, in which he explains Lazarus's Resurrection. He there confounds Mary, Lazarus's Sister, with the Woman that was a Sinner.

The 6th. is upon Palm-Sunday.

The two next upon the Exaltation of the Cross.

The three following are upon the Virgin's Death. In it he describes several miraculous Circumstances of her Death,

and particularly her triumphant Ascension into Heaven in Body and Soul.

The 12th. is a Panegyrick upon Titus, first Bishop of Crete.

The 13th. is upon St. George, whose Martyrdom he relates.

The 14th. is a Panegyrick upon St. Nicholas Bishop of Myra: He says nothing of his Life in particular, but only that he encountered the Arians; that he preserved Lycia from Famine, and converted an Heretick Bishop.

The 15th. contains the Praise, the Life and Miracles of a certain Monk, named Patapius.

The 16th. which is another Panegyrick upon Patapius, is not Andrew's of Crete, but some of his Scholars; who relates, how that holy Hermit appeared to Andrew of Crete, and what he had told him of his Life.

The 17th. contains excellent Instructions about the Miseries and uncertainty of human Life.

F. Combefis, in his Addition to the Bibliotheca Patrum, attributes also to Andrew of Crete two Homilies; the one upon the Virgin's Nativity, which had been published by Schottus, under the Name of German Bishop of Constantinople. Allatius hath attributed it to Gregory Bishop of Nicomedia; and it is found in some Manuscripts under St. John Damascene's Name. But F. Combefis having seen it in a Manuscript, under Andrew of Crete's Name, believes it rather to be his than the other's, because of a great number of compound Words commonly used by Andrew of Crete. The second is a Sermon upon the Beheading of St. John Baptist, already published by Lipomannus.

They attribute to this Archbishop Andrew a great number of Odes, Pieces in Prose, upon the Festivals of the Year, which F. Combefis hath joyned to his Homilies. He does also ascribe to him some Iambick Verses, directed to Agatho the Deacon, which are at the end of the Letter of this latter, in the second Volume of the Addition to the Bibliotheca Patrum. Some believe, that this Archbishop of Crete is also the Author of the Commentary on the Revelation, bearing the Name of Andrew of Casarea: Which maketh others think, that he was translated from the Archbishoprick of Crete, to that of Casarea in Cappadocia. But there is no need to suppose this groundless Translation: For, though we should suppose this Work to be Andrew's of Crete, which is uncertain, Casarea might perhaps have been put for Crete. This Author's Sermons are not so contemptible, as the most part of those of the modern Greeks; they are full of Wit, Learning and Morality, and want not Eloquence nor Greatness: His Discourse abounds with compound and hard Words; his Narrations are plain, his Reflections just, his Praises vehement, his Figures natural, and his Instructions solid.

ANASTASIUS.

Anastasis. **A**NASTASIUS, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Euthemius in Palestine, flourished about the year 740. St. John Damascene commends him in the beginning of his Treatise of the Trisagion, which he composed, to draw this Abbot out of the Error, which he thought him engaged in about this Point. They attribute to him a Treatise against the Jews, published in Latin in Canisius's Antiquities; and in the Bibliotheca Patrum, [Tom. 13.] but it might be supposed to be made by a more modern Author; for the Author of it says, that 800 years ago Christ's Oracles were fulfilled, that the Jews were dispersed, and Jerusalem destroyed by Vespasian: Which makes me think, that he lived to the ninth Century. This Author does not only bring Proofs for the Christian Religion, but he answers the Questions and Objections of the Jews. The Work is imperfect: It is found in Greek in the Vatican Library, and in the Jesuits at Rome. It is written well, and the Reasons he alleges are pretty solid. He observes, that when Christians honour Images, they do not adore the Wood, but their Respect refers to Christ and his Saints; and that they are so far from adoring Images, that, when they are grown old and spoiled, they burn them to make new ones.

Andreas Cretensis.

EGBERT of York.

Egbert.
[* Alias
Eadbert.]

Egbert, an *Engliffman*, Brother to * *Ethbert* King of *Northumberland*, was Archbishop of *York*, from 731, till about 767. The chief Work of *Egbert* was a *Penitential*, published in four Books, which are found in Manuscript in the Libraries of *England*. We have different Extracts of it: There is one, containing divers Canons concerning Clerks. Another composed of 35 Constitutions against divers Sins of Clerks, and other Christians. These Collections are ill contrived, and of little Authority.

There was printed in 1664 at *Dublin*, together with *Bo-*

niface's Letters, a Treatise about the Life of Clergymen, bearing *Egbert's* Name. It is made up of Questions and Answers; and the Questions are not directed to one Archbishop, but to many Bishops: 'Tis therefore a Consultation directed to a Council; but it seems to me to be much later than *Egbert*. The small Tract of the Remedies of Sins, ascribed to *Bede*, is one of the ancientest Extracts of *Egbert's Penitential*: All those Pièces are of no great Use. They are found in the end of the sixth Volume of the Councils of *F. Labbe's* Edition.

Egbert.

St. JOHN DAMASCENE.

St. J. D.
damascene.

John, surnamed *Mansur* [by the *Arabians*,] or *Chrysorroas* [from his Eloquence,] was born at *Damascus*, of rich and godly Parents. He was taught and brought up by *Cosmas*, a Monk of *Jerusalem*, who had been taken by the *Saracens*. After his Father's Decease, he succeeded him in the Place of Counsellor of State to the Prince of the *Saracens*. Being in that Office, he began to write in the Defence of Images; which did so highly provoke the Emperor *Leo*, surnamed *Eiseraulx*, that he formed a design to destroy him by an unparallel'd piece of Treachery: He caused one to counterfeit the Hand of *John Damascene*, and to contrive a Letter in his Name, whereby he betrayed his Master, advising *Leo* to come speedily to *Damascus*, to take that City. This Letter he sent to the Prince of the *Saracens*, who, if we believe the Author of *St. John Damascene's* Life, caused *John's* Hand to be immediately cut off, and to be for many hours exposed to the sight of the People in the middle of the Town. In the evening *John* demanding it, joyned it to his mangled Arm; afterward having prayed to the Virgin, and thereupon going to sleep, it was found re-united to his Arm when he awoke out of his Sleep. This Miracle struck the Prince of the *Saracens* with Amazement, and forced him to acknowledge *John's* Innocency; he prayed him to continue in his Court, but *John* choserather to withdraw himself from the World, and therefore betook himself into *St. Sabas's* Monastery at *Jerusalem*, where he was committed to the Care of a very severe old Monk, who imposed on him a perpetual Silence; for the breaking of which, he was turned out of his Cell by that old Man, who commanded him, for his Penance, to carry away the Filth of the Cells of the Monastery. When he had made himself ready to obey his Order, the good old man embraced him, and caused him to return. About the end of his Life, he was ordained Priest by the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; but he returned immediately again into his Monastery, from whence he did valiantly oppose the Opinion of the *Iconoclasts*. He died towards the year 750. This Author wrote a great number of Works of all kinds: They may

be divided into doctrinal, historical and moral, * heortastical, ecclesiastical and prophane. Among the doctrinal Works, we may place in the first Rank the four

Books of the orthodox Faith, in which he hath comprehended the whole Substance of Divinity in a scholastical and methodical Manner.

The first Book is of the Nature, Existence, and Attributes of God, and of the three Persons of the Trinity. In all Points he agreeth with our Divines, except in the Article of the Procession of the Holy Ghost, which he believes to proceed from the Father only.

The second Book treats of the Creatures, the World, the Angels and Demons, of Heaven and Earth, and all things contained therein, of Paradise, and of Man. He teaches, that Man is composed of a Body and a Soul, that his Soul is spiritual and immortal; he distinguisheth the Faculties of it; he speaks of its Passions, Actions, Thoughts, Will, and Liberty, which he places in the Power of doing what we please. He treats also of Providence, Prescience, and Predestination, or Predetermination. He affirms, that this taketh no place in free Actions; that God permits them, but ordains them not. He concludes with Man's Fall, of which *Adam's* Sin was the Cause.

This leads him to the Incarnation of the Son of God, which is the Subject of his third Book. He explains this Mystery with great Exactness; he establisheth the Distinction of the Existence of the two Natures; he speaks of their Proprieties, of the Wills of Christ, and of his Free-will, which he believes to be different from ours, in that the Determination of it is without any Doubt or Deliberation preceding. He enlargeth upon the two Wills of Christ; he explains in what Sense these Expressions are to be understood. There is in Christ an incarnate Nature, a *Theandrick* Will, and an human Nature deified. He shews, that Jesus Christ was subject neither to Ignorance, nor to Temptation; that the Quality of Slave does not belong to him; that he in-

creased in Knowledge and Wisdom so far forth only, as it did more appear outwardly, according as he grew into years. He proves, the human Nature did really suffer, whilst the Divinity remained impassible. He maintains, that the Divinity never ceased to be united to Christ's Soul and Body, no, not in the time of his Death.

In the 4th. having discoursed of Christ's Resurrection, and examined some Questions about the Incarnation, he treats of Baptism, of the Faith, the Cross, and the Worship due to it; of the Custom of praying towards the East; of the Holy Mysteries, in which we ought not to doubt, but Christ gives us his Body and Blood * to feed us, the Bread and Wine being † changed into Christ's Body and Blood, and being but one and the same thing. He

tells us, with what Purity we ought to receive such a holy Sacrament. He establisheth *Mary's* perpetual Virginity, both in and after the Birth, and reconciles the two Genealogies of Christ, after the same manner with *Africanus*. Then he proves, that Saints ought to be honoured, and their Relicks revered. He would also have the Images of Saints, and of Christ to be honoured, and believeth them to be very useful to remember us of them. He confesses, they do not worship the Matter whereof the Cross or the Images are made, but only that which is represented thereby. He says, that this Custom is established by an ancient Tradition, and thereupon he quotes the fabulous Story of the Image sent by Christ to King *Agharus*. He takes notice, that no Image of God ought to be made. He maketh a Catalogue of the Sacred Books of the Old Testament, agreeable to the Canon of the *Hebrews*. To the Books of the New, he adds the Canons of the Apostles, which he thinks to have been collected by *St. Clemens*. Having treated of all these things, he comes again to some Questions he had forgotten. He explains, how many ways they speak of Christ. He proves, God is not the Author of Sins, and that there is but one Principle of all things. He renders a Reason, why God created some Men, who would sin, and not repent. He shews what's the Law of Sin, and the Law of Grace. He gives some Reasons of the Observation of the Sabbath, and Circumcision. He extols the State of Virginity. He concludes with some Reflections upon Antichrist, the Resurrection, and the last Judgment: Whereupon he says, 'That Hell Fire shall not be material as that among us, but such as God knows; *Non materia hujusce nostri constantem, sed qualem Deus novit*. This Work is in *Greek* and *Latin* in the *Basil* Edition, [in 1548, and 1575.] *St. John Damascene* wrote many Tracts more upon some particular Doctrines.

A Dialogue between a *Christian* and a *Saracen* about Religion.

Another Dialogue under the Name of an Orthodox *Christian* and a *Manichee*, in which he disputes against the Errors of those Hereticks.

A Treatise of the two Natures against the * *Monothelites*, who did admit but one Nature in Christ, made up of two.

A Treatise of the *Trisagion* against the Addition of *Peter* the Fuller, wherein he explains several Forms of Speech about the Trinity, and the Incarnation.

A Treatise of the two Wills in Christ against the *Monothelites*.

Another upon the Trinity, and the Incarnation.

To these Tracts may be added, the last Article of his *Logic*, wherein he explains what is the *Hypostatic Union*, and his Institutes, containing an Explication of the Terms used by him in speaking of the Mysteries, as *Essence*, *Substance*, *Person*, *Hypostasis*, &c.

The three Orations upon Images belong to the doctrinal Tracts. He distinguisheth two sorts of Worship and Adoration; the one supream, belonging to God only; the other a Worship of Honour and Respect only. He says, the Matter of Images is not worshipped, but what is represented by them; that they are instead of Books to the Ignorant,

[* The Acephali; or Monophysites, a Sort of Hereticks, Dr. Cave.]

St. J. D.
damascene.

St. J. Damascene. rant, and, that in worshipping of them, they worship the Saints, of whom they are the Images. He cites St. Basil to authorize this Use of them. He objects to himself St. Epiphanius's Letter, and answers, either that that Letter is supposititious, or that he caused the Picture he speaks of to be buried, only for some particular Reasons; like as St. Athanasius caused the Relicks of Saints to be buried, to condemn the prophane Practice of the Egyptians. He cites several Passages of the Fathers, to prove, that the Images of Saints are to be honoured; but there is hardly one Word proving directly what he maintains, tho' he relates a great many Passages in those three Orations. He owns, the Worship of Images cannot be established from Holy Scripture, and that it is authorized by the Tradition of the Church only. Lastly, he confesses, no Image ought to be made of the Trinity, nor of things purely spiritual.

The Prayer for the Dead is another Point, which is also not proved but by the Tradition of the Church. St. John Damascene defends it in an Oration made for that purpose. In it he affirms, that the Prayer for the Dead is from the Tradition of the Apostles. He adds, that the Church does nothing but what is useful and pleasing to God; from whence he concludes, that by those Prayers they obtain the Remission of those Sins which remain to be expiated by the Dead. He relates the Fable of Trajan's Deliverance, and a Story that happened to St. John the Almsgiver.

We may moreover add to these Tracts, two very short Treatises; the one, in what consists the Image and Similitude of God, in which we were created; and the other, of the Last Judgment. Besides, we may add to these, two Letters about the Mass, and the Consecration; but I do not believe them to be St. John Damascene's.

The historical Works of St. John Damascene are fewer in number.

We have a Treatise of Heresies, which bears his Name; but the twenty four first are nothing but the Abridgment of St. Epiphanius.

The rest, beginning at the Nestorians, were added by St. John Damascene. He joyns to the Hereticks already known, viz. the Nestorians, Eutychians, Monophysites, Aphthartodocites, Theodetians, Jacobites, Agnoetes, Donatists, Monothelites, Saracens and Iconoclasts. He joyns, I say, to these, other unknown Sects of Persons that had extraordinary Opinions and Practices, namely, the Semidalites, who taste of the Paste brought to them by Dioscorus's Scholars, and believe this is to them instead of Sacrifice; the Orchistes, which are Monks dancing, when they sing God's Praises; the Gnosimachi, who will not have Men to write or study, a good Life being sufficient; the Heliotropites, who believe there is a certain Vertue in the Herb, called Turnsol or Heliotrope; the Thnetopsychites, who believe Mens Souls to be like to the Beasts, and that they die with them; the Theotatocheftes, who find fault with some Expressions in the Scripture; the Christolites, who believe that Christ hath left his Soul and Body in Hell, and that the Godhead only ascended up to Heaven; the Ethnophrones, who retain some Pagan Superstitions; the Ethiproscoptes, who find fault with ancient Usages, and introduce new ones; the Parermenewtes, who interpret several Places of the Old and New Testament according to their own Fancy; and the Lampetians, living after their own Fashion. It is plain, that St. John Damascene gave what Names he pleased to those he thought to be of these Opinions and Practices, tho' they made not a Body nor a Sect. Part of the Greek of this small Tract was published by Billius, at the End of his Edition [at Paris in 1619.] but M. Cotelier published it not long ago whole in his Monuments of the Greek Church, Vol. I. p. 278.

The History of Barlaam contains a long Narrative of the Conversion of the Son of the King of the Indies, called Josaphat by the Monk Barlaam; 'tis more like a Romance than an History. Some think it is not St. John Damascene's; nevertheless, it is like enough to his Style, and all of it is agreeable to his Doctrine, except in the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, which may have been added by the Interpreter in the Translation, as also in the Original by some Transcriber.

We have but one of his moral Works; but it is as considerable in its kind, as the Book of the Orthodox Faith is: For St. John Damascenus hath comprehended in three Books, intituled *Parallels*, an infinite number of Precepts and Maxims of Morality, reduced to different Heads, under which he first citeth some Sentences of the Scripture, and then some Passages of several Fathers.

The heartastick Works of St. John are very numerous, but few of them are printed. These are printed.

A Sermon on Christ's Transfiguration, in Greek and Latin.

Three Discourses upon the Virgin's Nativity; also in Greek and Latin.

Two upon her Assumption, in Latin only.

A Sermon upon Holy Saturday, published in Greek and Latin by Billius [and in Greek and Latin by Pantinus, at Antw. in 1601.]

His ecclesiastical Works, or Books of the Divine Service, are,

Some Hymns on the great Festivals; Odes and Profes for the Service of the whole Year, distinguished into two Parts. They are not all St. John Damascene's; but some are Metrophanes's and other Authors.

Lastly, we have a Book of Logick and another of Physick, of St. John Damascene.

These are the Works contained in the most perfect Editions of St. John Damascene. The first Editions contained but few Works.

His three Discourses of Image-worship were printed in Greek at Rome, in 1553. in Latin at Paris, in 1555. and at Antw. in 1556.

The History of Barlaam and Josaphat, at Paris, in 1568. at Cologne in 1593. at Antw. 1602.

His four Books of the Orthodox Faith were printed in Latin at Paris, in 1507. in Greek at Verona, in 1531.

The Dialogue against the Manicheans, at Basil, in 1578. [at Passaw in 1572. 8vo.]

The Hymns, at Paris, in 1575.

They printed in 1539. 1548. and 1575. at Basil, a Collection of the chief Works of this Father, wherein are found the Books of the Orthodox Faith in Greek. Since that, Billius made a much larger Collection of them, containing all the Works above-mentioned. It was printed at Paris, in 1577. 1603. and 1619. but it hath few Works in Greek.

M. Aubert having published St. Cyril, designed to undertake a new Edition of St. John Damascene's Works, and having communicated his Design to the Learned, had collected several Pieces; among the rest, M. Allatius sent him a great number of his Works, never published before, which he had taken the Pains to get copied out from some MSS. and to translate them himself. M. Aubert dying before he could execute this Design, F. Labbe promised, in 1652. an Edition of St. John Damascene's Works; and printed a Specimen of it, wherein he set down the Names of the Works which Allatius had communicated to M. Aubert, without mentioning what this learned Man had contributed to it; yea, and intimating, that he received no help by his MSS. Allatius having heard of it by F. Goar, complain'd, that F. Labbe would set himself forth by his Labours, without expressing the least Acknowledgment of them; and he published a Catalogue of the Manuscripts of St. John Damascene, which he had sent to M. Aubert, and of them he had by him yet, and which he had to send. These are mentioned there.

A Panegyrick of St. John Chrysostome, and the following Sermons, on the Virgin's Nativity; on Christ's Presentation in the Temple; on the Virgin's Death, and the Fig-tree dried up; a Confession of the Catholick Faith; a Treatise of Malice and Virtue; an historical Tract of Christ's Birth; the Greek Treatise of the Dialogue between a Christian and a Saracen; Definitions; other Definitions; a Treatise of the Divinity and the Incarnation of Christ; a Treatise of Christ's Body; another against the Jacobites; two Treatises against the Nestorians; a Writing containing the Passages of the Fathers, proving, that Christ is composed of two Natures, and that there be two Natures in him; a Treatise of the two Wills and the two Operations in Christ; a Writing upon Easter; a Prayer; a Sermon on the Annunciation of the Virgin; a Treatise to those that believe two Natures, two Wills and two Operations in Christ. Those are the Works of St. John Damascene, which Allatius had sent to M. Aubert, together with several other Pieces of the Greeks upon St. John Damascene's Works, of the Life of this Saint, and a critical Censure upon his Works, made by Allatius himself. He was moreover to send him his Lexicon, which he says is a large Work, rare, and contains in it many things, with several other Greek Pieces, the Titles whereof may be seen in the Catalogue it self, in the End of the Collection of the Greek Works published by Allatius, and printed at Antwerp in 1653.

St. John Damascene writes clearly and methodically; he was a subtle Divine, an able Compiler, but a mean Preacher.

† St. CHRODEGAND Bishop of Metz.

Chrodegand Son of Landrada, having spent his Youth in the Court of Charles Martel, was advanced, under Pepin's Reign, to the Bishoprick of Metz, and ordained by Pope Stephen (An. 743.) He was the Founder and Restorer of the common Life of Clerks; for, V. O. L. II.

having taken Possession of his Bishoprick, he caused his Clergy to dwell in a Cloyster, gave them a Rule, and supplied them with all the Necessaries of Life, that they might take no more Care for earthly things, but might apply themselves wholly to God's Service only.

This Rule of *Chrodegand* was published, in its native Purity, by F. Labbe, out of a Copy transcribed from an ancient Manuscript of the *Vatican Library*. F. *Dacherius* had printed one under his Name in his *Spicilegium*; but this is a Rhapsody patched up out of the true Rule of *Chrodegand*, Decrees of the Council of *Aix-la-Chapelle* and some other Monastick Rules. The true one hath but 34 Articles, with a Preface to them, wherein *Chrodegand* tells his Clergy, that, if the Canons of the *Nicene Councils* were yet in force, and the Bishop and his Clerks lived according to their Rules, there would be no need for him to make a new Rule; but having found the Clergy and the People of his Diocese remiss and loose, he thought himself obliged to prescribe these Rules: That he enjoins all the People of his Diocese, to live in Unity and Love, to frequent the Divine Service constantly, to be obedient to their Bishop, to avoid Law-suits and Divisions, to give no Offence; and the Pastors to look to their Flocks, as knowing they must one day give an account of them to the Pastor of Pastors.

Then he prescribes some particular Rules to his Clerks.

In the 1st. Article he recommends Humility to them.

In the 2^d. he binds them, to take place of one another according to their Seniority in Orders. He will not have them to call themselves by their proper Names, without adding the Name of their Dignity; that the younger Clerks, when they meet their Seniors, shall bow to them, and ask their Blessing; that being set down, they shall rise up and give them their place. He enjoins young Men to observe this Rule, and preserve Modesty in all things.

The 3^d. Article imports, that they shall all lye in the same Cloyster, in different Cells; that Women shall not come into the Cloyster, no, nor any Layman, without an Order from the Bishop, the Archdeacon or the Chancellor; that they shall eat all together in the same Hall; that no Laick shall be admitted into the Cloyster.

The 4th. Article imports, that all the Clerks shall repair to the Church of St. *Stephen* at *Compline*; after which last part of the Office they shall eat no more, and they shall keep Silence till the first Hour of Prayer; and if any Body did not return home at *Compline*, he is forbidden to knock at the Door, or to come into the Cloyster before the Hour of the Nocturnal Office. Clerks are forbidden to stay in Town after the Hour of *Compline*, without coming to it.

The 5th, 6th, and 7th. Articles, order the time and manner of singing the Divine Service in the Day and Night time.

In the 8th. he orders them to come every Day into the Chapter-house after the Office of the first Hour, to read there some of the Instructions made by him, or of the Homilies on *Sundays*, *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, and there to receive Orders and Reproofs of the Bishop or Archdeacon.

In the 9th. Article he enjoins them to perform the bodily Labours, as well in common as in private.

In the 10th. he will have the Clerks, when they are upon a Journey, to keep their Rule whilst they are travelling, and to recite their Office.

In the 11th. he charges them to be zealous.

In the 12th. he forbids private Persons to strike or to excommunicate their Brethren.

In the 13th. he forbids them to make Parties one against the other.

In the 14th. having represented the Usefulness of Confession, he chargeth the Clerks to confess their Sins twice every year to their Bishop, or to the Presbyters appointed by the Bishop, once in the beginning of *Lent*, and the other time between the 15th. of *August* and beginning of *November*. And all those who are guilty of no Crime, to receive the Body and Blood of Christ every *Sunday*, and on the great Festivals. He declares, that, if any Body hath concealed his Sins from his Bishop, and goes to confess to other Priests, fearing, lest the Bishop should degrade him or hinder his Admission, and if the Bishop comes to know it, he that hath done so, shall be scourged severely or be imprisoned. For he is a very wicked Man, saith he, who sins before God, and will not confess his Sins to him, of whom he ought to receive Advice for the Recovery of his Health.

The 15th. ordains, that Clerks guilty of heinous Crimes, such as Murders, Fornication, Adultery, Robbery and such like; shall be chastised on their Body, and then sent into Exile or cast into Prison, where they shall stay as long as the Bishop pleases; that when they come out, they shall moreover do publick Penance; that is, they shall stay at the Church-door prostrate, whilst others go in and come out,

and they shall not enter in during the Service, but they shall say it standing at the Door; that they shall use such Abstinence as the Bishop shall impose upon them; and that they shall receive a Blessing from no Body, before they be reconciled; that they shall sue for this Reconciliation publicly, being prostrate on the Ground, and the Bishop shall reconcile them according to the Order of the Canons.

The 16th. excommunicates him who shall keep Company with an excommunicated Person.

The 17th. ordains, that for lesser Faults, such as Pride, Disobedience, Arrogancy, Detraction and the Faults against the Rule, those who are faulty shall first of all be admonished before one or two Witnesses; if they do not amend, they shall be reprov'd publicly; and if they persist, they shall be excommunicated; and, lastly, if they prove incorrigible, they shall have a corporal Punishment inflicted upon them.

The 18th. is concerning much lighter Faults, such as coming late to Meat, he chargeth the Clerks to come presently to discover them to the Bishop, who shall impose a light Punishment upon them; but if they do not submit to it, and their Fault come to be known, they shall be more severely punished.

The 19th. declares, that Penance to be imposed, ought to bear proportion with the Faults.

In the 20th. he ordains, that Clerks shall not eat till after the *Vespers*; That they shall abstain from things prescribed by the Bishop; That they shall not eat out of the Monastery during this time, except in case of great necessity; That they shall not go out neither, without necessity; That they shall give themselves to Reading; That from *Easter* to *Whitsunday* they shall eat twice aday, and they shall eat Flesh, except on *Fridays*; That from *Whitsunday* till St. *John's* day, they shall eat twice also, but shall abstain from Flesh-meat at the first Meal; That from *Midsummer* to St. *Martin's* day, they shall eat twice a Day, but shall eat no Flesh on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*; That from St. *Martin's* day till *Christmas*, they shall not eat till after the 9th. Hour, and shall abstain from Flesh; That from *Christmas* to *Lent*, they shall fast till the ninth Hour, on *Mondays*, *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, and on the other Days they shall be allowed two Meals; That they shall abstain from Flesh only on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, unless they happen to be Holy-days, and the Superior permits them to eat of it; That the Bishop may dispense with the Infirm as to their Abstinence; Lastly, That his Clergy may eat Flesh during the *Octave of Whitsunday*.

In the 21st. he prescribes the order of the Tables in the Hall, and ordains that there shall be Reading when they are at Meat, and prescribes some other Particulars about the order of the Hall.

In the 22^d. and 23^d. he comes to Particulars about the quality and quantity of the Meat and Drink.

The 24th. obliges all the Clerks to wait in the Kitchen, except the Archdeacon and the Chancellor.

The following Articles are concerning the Duties of Officers, of the Archdeacon, the Chancellor, the Butler, and the Porter.

The 28th. is concerning the care to be had of the Infirm and Sick.

In the 29th. he provides for the clothing and warming of them.

In the 30th. he sets down the Festivals when the Bishop is to feast them.

In the 31st. he enjoins the Clerks of his Society to have a Propriety in nothing, and to give what they have to the Church of St. *Paul*: Yet he gives them leave to reserve the use of it to themselves for Almsgiving, and to dispose of their Moveables, as they please, by their Wills.

The 32^d. imports, That the Alms bestowed upon private Persons, as upon Priests for saying Mass or hearing Confessions, or upon other Clerks for praying, shall be their own; but those bestowed upon the Community shall be common. He will not have Ecclesiastical Persons to take a great quantity of Alms, for fear of over-burdening themselves with the Sins of others.

The 33^d. Article is concerning the time and manner in which those Clerks ought to come to Mass on Holy-days.

The last Canon respects Clerks inducted into other Churches; he charges them to come twice in a Month, once a fortnight to the Church of St. *Stephen*, to receive necessary Instructions and Advices from the Bishop, or him who taketh care of that Church.

STEPHEN II.

After *ZACHARY's* decease, the Romans elected a Presbyter, named, *Stephen*, in his room; but this dying 3 days after his Election, they preferred to the Pontificate, the 27th. of *March*, 752. Pope *Constantine's* Son, named *Stephen II*. In the beginning of his Pontificate, he repaired and built Hospitals. *Astulphus*, who

was then King of *Lombardy*, threatned the City of *Rome*. *Stephen*, to appease his Fury, sent Deputies with Presents to him, and concluded a Peace with him for 40 Years; but *Astulphus*, intending to make himself Master of *Rome*, did soon break it. The Pope sent some Religious Persons to him to pacifie him; but he did not at all regard their Entreaties

Stephen II. treaties or Arguments. In this Conjunction, *John*, the chief Silentiary of the Emperor of Greece, came to Rome with some Letters from the Emperor to the Pope, and to King *Astulphus*, whom he did exhort to restore the Places he had usurped. He brought these Orders to *Astulphus*, who slighted them, and sent him back again, without any favourable Answer. The Pope seeing the danger he was in, sent some Deputies to the Emperor, to let him know, That it was high time for him to come with an Army to defend the Provinces he had yet in Italy, if he had a mind to preserve them; and for his part, he employed publick Prayers, to obtain from God the Peace of Italy, and endeavoured, with Entreaties, to still the Anger of the King of Lombardy. But seeing, at last, there was no hope left of any assistance from the Greek Emperor, he applied himself to *Pepin* King of France, who did voluntarily offer himself to help the Pope and the Romans. He judged it fit to bring the Pope into France, where he received him favourably, and promised him, that he would force the Lombard to restore him the Exarchy of Ravenna, and all the Territories belonging to the Romans. *Astulphus*, to avert this Storm, sent *Carloman*, *Pepin's* Brother, who was a Monk in Mount-Cassin, to oppose this design; but he could not dissuade *Pepin* from his Enterprize, wherefore he retreated into a Monastery in France. *Pepin* did immediately send Ambassadors to the King of the Lombards, to oblige him to make Peace, and to restore to the Romans the Towns and Lands he had taken from them. The Pope likewise urged him by Letters, but all in vain; so *Pepin* came with an Army to attack him. The Lombard, having essay'd to force *Pepin's* Troops which were in a Passage of the *Alpes*, was routed, put to flight, and forced to fly into *Pavia*, which was presently besieged by *Pepin's* Army. *Astulphus* was forced to sue for Peace, which was granted him, upon condition, he should restore the Exarchy of Ravenna, and what he had taken. But instead of performing this Treaty, as soon as he was delivered, he marched towards Rome, with an intent to take it. *Pepin* having notice of it, returned again with his Army, besieged *Astulphus*, and forced him to perform the Articles of the Treaty. The Greek Emperor's Envoy re-demanded the Exarchy of Ravenna; but *Pepin* looking upon that Country as an Estate which he had acquired by the right of Arms, gave it to the Church of Rome, and sent *Fulradus*, Abbot of St. Denys, to receive the Towns of the *Pentapolis* and *Æmilia*, which the Lombard was bound to restore. After *Astulphus's* death, *Desiderius*, who had possessed himself of the Kingdom of the Lombards, confirmed this Treaty, and rendred to the Pope all the places agreed on. All this was done under *Stephen*

II's Pontificate, which lasted 5 Years. He died Apr. 24. 757. *Stephen II's*

This Pope's Letters are concerning all those Affairs. In the 1st. he thanks *Pepin* for the assistance he had promised by *Chrodegand*. In the 2^d. he desires the great French Lords to help forward his request to their King. In the 3^d. directed to King *Pepin*, whom he calls his Godfather, and to his Sons *Charles* and *Carloman*, whom he styles Kings and Nobles of Rome, he entreats them to cause *Astulphus* to perform the Treaty he had made. In the 4th. he begs *Pepin's* help against *Astulphus*, who was come to besiege the City of Rome. The 5th. is a Letter in St. Peter and *Stephen's* Name, to implore Aid against the Lombards. It seems to be Supposititious, and of a quite different Style from the rest. The 6th. is a Letter of Thanks to *Pepin*, for setting at liberty the City and Church of Rome. He informs him, withal, of the death of *Astulphus*, and that *Desiderius* succeeded him, and entreats him to cause him to restore the rest of the Towns of the Exarchate and the *Pentapolis*, which were to be restored to him by the agreement. There is a 7th. Letter, wherein he requests *Pepin* and his Sons to force *Astulphus*, to restore him the Towns and Lands which they had bestowed upon the Holy See.

To these Letters are joined 4 Privileges granted by *Stephen* to *Fulradus*, Abbot of St. Denys, and a Relation of a Revelation which they pretend this Pope had, being extreme sick in the Abby of St. Denys; but these last Monuments are of small Authority and good for little. This Pope's Letters are eloquent and powerful: We have moreover, under his Name, a Collection of some Canonical Constitutions which he made at *Cressy*, to answer the Questions propounded to him by the Monks of the Monastery of *Bretigny*. It contains 19 Constitutions, for the most part, drawn out of Popes Decrees, and the preceding Councils; but there be some upon Baptism somewhat singular: For in the 11th. he excuses a Priest, who in case of necessity had baptized with Wine for want of Water, and he intimates that Baptism, to be valid, in these words: *Infantes sic permanent in ipso Baptismo*. I know very well that some have believed, that this *Parentthesis* is a Gloss impertinently crept into the Text, and that some others have pretended, that of these 19 Articles 10 are Supposititious, whereof this one; but all this is said without any Ground against the Faith of the ancient Manuscript, from which they were taken. *Walafrid* reports, that this Pope brought the Roman way of singing in to France, which appears plainly by *Charlemagne's* Capitularies.

WILLIBALD.

Willibald. WILLIBALD, Born of an * illustrious Family, [in Devonshire] in England, [Scholar and Nephew to St. Boniface, was by his Parents put into the Abby of Waldheim to be instructed by the Abbot Egviwald, when he was but five Years old,] being grown up he travelled to Rome, and Jerusalem, and at length retreated about the Year 728 into the Monastery of Mount Cassin. In the Year 739 [going to Rome again] he was sent into Germany by St. Gregory III,

[to assist Boniface in the Conversion of that Nation,] and [by him] in the Year 741, was ordained Bishop of *Eistad*, and was present at a Synod held in Germany in 742, he * [* Bale fixes his Death in his Successor, which is extant in *Carissus's* Antiquities, 781, in the Third Century of the Saints of the Benedictine Order, set forth by F. Mabillon: 77 Year of his Age.]

JOHN, Patriarch of Jerusalem.

John &c. THIS Patriarch, who sat in the See of Jerusalem (* Anno 759,) is thought to be the Author of St. John Damascene's Life, which we have in Latin on-
[* Dr. Cave places him in 842.]

ly, at the beginning of that Father's Works. It is written in the form of a Panegyrick.

GODESCHALCUS.

Godeschal- GODESCHALCUS, a Deacon and Canon of Liege, wrote about the Year 770, at the request of his Bishop *Agilfridus*, the Life of St. Lambert, Bishop of Liege, and Martyr. It hath been printed in the Collection of the Me-

moirs of Liege, by *Joan. Chapeavillus*, [Tom. I. at Liege in 1612, Quarto,] and in the Third Century of the Saints of the Benedictine Order.

AMBROSIUS AUTPERTUS.

Ambrosius Autpertus. AMBROSIUS AUTPERTUS, a French Benedictine Monk, and Abbot of St. Vincent, [a Monastery situate near the head of the River Volturnus,] died about the Year 778. His Writings are honourably cited by *Paulus Diaconus*, in his History of the Lombards, and the Author of the Chronology of this Abby wrote his Life, and made a Catalogue of his Writings. We have a great Commentary of his upon the Revelation, in which he puts a Moral Sense upon all that is said in that Book.

F. Labbe says, That there are also some Commentaries of Ambrose on the Psalms and the Song of Songs, printed, at Cologne in 1536. But F. Oudin, who did both seek himself, and got others carefully to seek for those Works, declares, he could not find them. The Book of the Conflict of Virtues and Vices, which was among St. Austine's Works, and which bears Ambrose's Name in some Manuscripts, is this Author's; he wrote a Tract of Concupiscence, which is found in Manuscript, in *Bennet's* College Library of Cambridge.

bridge. He made the Lives of the Saints *Paldon*, *Tuton*, and *Ambrosius Vason*, the first Abbots of *St. Benedict of Volturnus* which *Auspertus* are so much the better, because he hath only represented their Virtues, without relating any Miracles. He hath composed several Works, and some are found in Manuscripts under his Name, and others are printed under other Authors Names. There is one upon our Saviour's Transfi-

guration, which is at the end of his Commentary upon the *Revelation*, in a Manuscript of the Abby of *St. German-des-Prez*. He hath made one on the Virgin's Assumption, which was the 18th. among *St. Austine's* Sermons upon the Saints. There is one upon the Purification, printed among the Sermons, attributed to *St. Ambrose*, which is found inserted in an Homily upon the same Festival, made by *Alcuin*.

*Ambrosius
Auspertus.*

PAUL I.

Paul. I. **S**TEPHEN the second being near Death, one Party of the People appointed his Brother *Paul* to be his Successor. Another Party was for *Theophylactus* the Archdeacon; but after *Stephen's* Death, *Paul's* Party being the stronger, he was preferred to the Holy See. He was pious and charitable to the Poor, repaired several Churches, and built Monasteries. He wrote to the Emperors *Constantine* and *Leo* for Image-Worship, and to *Pepin*, to implore his Aid against the *Lombards*, and the *Greeks*. He died in *June 767*.

This is the Catalogue and the Abridgment of this Pope's Letters, written to *Pepin*, as they are found in a Manuscript of the *Vatican*, and as they have been set out by *Gretser*. The *Roman* Figures mark the order of the *Vatican* Manuscript, and the *Arabick* that of *Gretser's* Collection. Neither of them are exact.

I. 13. He acquaints King *Pepin* with his Brother *Stephen's* Death, and his own Ordination. He prays him to continue his protection and friendship to him, assuring him of his Fidelity. It was sent by *Simon*, *Pepin's* Ambassador.

II. 12. He gives to *Pepin* the Monastery of *St. Sylvester*, built on the top of Mount *Soracte*, together with three circumjacent Monasteries, which *Carloman* had given to *Zachary*.

III. 43. He thanks *Pepin* for defending of him against his Enemies, he promises him, he will take care to teach his Brother's Psalmody to the Monks he had sent him.

IV. 39. He prays him to cause *Marinus* the Presbyter to be ordained Bishop in *France*, and dissuades him from designs contrary to the Holy See.

V. 38. He congratulates *Pepin's* Prosperity, and happy Journey, and tells him, that his Legates are not yet come back from *Constantinople*.

VI. 37. He returns him thanks, for protecting the Church of *Rome*; he tells him, that next after God he puts his confidence in *Pepin's* assistance; he desires him to send him an Ambassador, by whose means he may discover to him the designs and snares of the *Greeks*.

VII. 35. He sends him a Copy of the Letters wrote to a Monk by *Cosmus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*.

VIII. 33. He sends him word that the *Greek* Emperor is in Arms to assault *Ravenna*, and begs his help against the *Greeks*.

IX. 30. He says, that he shall speak with *Desiderius* King of *Lombardy* at *Ravenna*, and would cause him to make preparations to defend him against the *Greeks*.

X. 30. He clears himself from the Accusation brought against him, of saying, that *Pepin* would not help the *Romans*; he tells him, that they heard nothing of those who had been sent over to *Constantinople* from him and *Pepin*. He leaves it to his choice to deal with *Marinus*, as he shall think fit; he sends him some Letters that he had received from *Ravenna*.

XI. 31. He enquires of *Pepin's* Health, and the Success of his Journey; because his Enemies spread a report, that it was not prosperous.

XII. He complains of the Injury done him by the People of *Beneventum*; he desires *Pepin* to write sharply to them, and in case they did not obey, to consent that they may be dealt with as they had designed.

XIII. 29. He lets him know, that he hath made peace with *Desiderius*. He desires him to give him his Hostages back again, that he may receive the Town of *Imola*.

XIV. 28. He sends a Copy of the Letters he had received from *Sergius* Archbishop of *Ravenna*; he desires him to write to *Desiderius* to help him to defend *Ravenna*, and the *Pentapolis*.

XV. 27. He tells him that the *Lombards* will restore nothing which they had taken, and that he endeavours the Restoration of *Sergius* in the Archbishoprick of *Ravenna*. He recommends Bishop *Vulchorius* to *Pepin*.

XVI. 26. He commends *Pepin* for his constant protection of the Church of *Rome*, of which the Letters brought

by *Wilfridus* were a fresh Testimony. He approves of his detaining the Legates, return'd from *Constantinople*, till the Synod. He leaves it to him to order things as he shall think best, about the matter of Bishop *George*, and *Peter* the Presbyter. He tells him, that *Desiderius* came to *Rome* the last Autumn, and that they had agreed, that he should deliver what belong'd to the Church into the hands of *Pepin's* Ambassadors. He returns him thanks for writing to *Desiderius*, to warn him to oblige the *Neapolitans*, and those of *Cajeta*, to restore the Church Patrimony to the Church, and to let their Bishops be consecrated by the Holy See.

XVII. 24. He lets him know that Six Noblemen will come from *Constantinople* to *Rome*, and that they will go into *France* to see him. He complains, that *Desiderius* hath not kept his Promise which he made before *Pepin's* Envoys. He desires him to send Three Ambassadors, one to *Desiderius* at *Pavia*, and the other two to *Rome* to help him.

XVIII. 25. He sends to *Pepin* the Rescript which he demanded, to grant the title of *St. Chrysogonus* to *Marinus* the Presbyter. He sends some Books to *Pepin*, and among the rest *St. Denys the Arcopagite's* Books, written in *Greek*.

XIX. 23. He thanks him for protecting the Church.

XX. 21. He writes to him about the Treaty made by *Remedius* a Bishop, and *Autcarius*, *Pepin's* Envoys with *Desiderius*, and gives him notice, that they are agreed to restore the Church to all her Rights before *April*; that he had received part of them already, and that he gave him assurance of the rest.

XXI. 19. He gives him notice, that the Ambassadors he had sent have discovered the Fraud of the *Lombards* about the Restitution promised.

XXII. 20. He thanks him for imparting to him, what had passed between him and the Ambassadors of the Emperor of *Constantinople*, and the Answers he gave them, with the Letters he had written to that Prince. He intercedes with him for *Tassilon*, Duke of *Bavaria*. He tells him, the *Greek* Emperor is vexed at him upon the account of Image-Worship.

XXIII. 18. He thanks him for his constant affection to the Holy See, comparing him to *David*.

XXIV. 17. He answers two Letters of *Pepin*. He tells him, they have agreed that his Envoys, together with the Deputies of the Cities, should go to *Desiderius*, because he had not only not restored all that he had taken, but went about to take again what he had restored.

XXV. 16. He commends *Pepin* for his protecting the Church, comparing him to *Moses*; he thanks him for the Monastery he had given him upon Mount *Soracte*.

XXVI. 15. He complains of the Cruelty and Malice of the *Lombards*. He says, that he hath given some other Letters to his Legates, whereby he required *Desiderius's* Hostages to be sent back again. He tells him the reason that forced him to write thus to him, and desires him to do nothing till *Desiderius* had restored the Church's Patrimony.

XXVII. 14. He complains of the *Lombard's* Invasions, tho' *Desiderius* had falsely affirmed the contrary. He thanks him for the Table he had offered to *St. Peter's* Tomb. He leaves it to him, to detain two Bishops, if he thinks fit.

XXVIII, XXIX, XXX. 42, 41, 40. These three Letters are directed to *Charles* and *Carloman*, *Pepin's* Sons, whom he exhorts to protect and defend the Church of *Rome*, following their Father's steps.

The XXXI. 22. is to all the *French* Army, which he thanks for their Service to the Church of *Rome*. There are ten of his Letters whole in the 6th. Vol. of the Councils, with a Privilege granted to *Paul*, for the Monastery of *St. Hilary*, in the Diocese of *Ravenna*, and the Foundation of the Monastery of *St. Stephen*, and *St. Sylvester*, erected by this Pope.

Paul. I.

STEPHEN III.

Stephen III. **P**AUL I. being at the point to die, *Toton*, Duke of *Nepi*, who dwelt at *Rome*, brought many armed Men thither, who took *Constantine*, his Brother, who was but a Layman as yet, put him in possession of the

Pope's Palace, the next Day caused him to be ordain'd Subdeacon and Deacon, and the Sunday after to be consecrated Bishop of *Rome* by three Bishops. Two of the chief Officers of the *Roman* Church, viz. *Christopher*, Secretary, and *Sergius*,

Stephen III.

Stephen III. *Sergius*, Chaplain, being not able to bear with this Violence, fled to the King of the *Lombards*, and having received his Orders, returned to *Rome* with a Band of armed Men. Being got into the Town, they were set on by *Toton* and his Creatures; but *Toton* being slain in the Conflict, *Constantine* was turned out, and one named *Philip*, a Priest and Monk, was chosen to sit in the Holy See. But *Christopher* the Secretary, who had been Head of this Enterprize, forced him to withdraw into his Monastery, and in August in the Year 768, procured the unanimous Election of *Stephen*, who came from *Sicily* to *Rome*, under the Pontificate of *Gregory* the third, and from that time had been much esteemed in the Church of *Rome*. After his Election, *Constantine* was shamefully deposed, those of his Party were very cruelly used; they carried their Fury so far, as to go and fetch him out of the Monastery, where he was shut up, to pull out his Eyes. After these Cruelties *Waldipert*, a Presbyter, who had brought the *Lombards* to *Rome* to expel *Constantine*, would also have apprehended *Christopher* the Secretary, and the chief Citizens of *Rome*, to deliver them up to the *Lombards*; but they sent a Viscount against him, who heading the People, took him Prisoner, and put out his Eyes. During all those Troubles, *Stephen* sent into *France* to request the King to send some Bishops to *Rome*, there to set things in order in a Council. *Sergius*, sent by the Pope, found *Pepin* dead, and delivered the Letter to his Sons *Charles* and *Carloman*, who sent twelve French Bishops to *Rome*, who held a Council there, with the Bishops of *Italy*, to which they brought *Constantine* blind, as he was. The first Day he beg'd the Council's Forgiveness, and to excuse himself, told them, that the People had forced him; but the next Day he vindicated himself, affirming, that it was no new thing, for Laicks to be raised to the Episcopal Dignity, that *Sergius* was made Bishop of *Ravenna*, from a Layman; and *Stephen* Bishop of *Naples*. The Bishops, being provoked by this Defence, caused him to be beaten, and turned out of the Church. Afterward the whole Matter was examined, and the Acts of the Council, that had confirmed *Constantine*, were burnt. After this, Pope *Stephen* fell down prostrate, with the Bishops, and those of the People, who had communicated with *Constantine*, and having confessed their Fault, and ask'd Forgiveness with Tears, they imposed a Penance on them. The Council caused the Canons, forbidding to elect Laymen, to be read, and made several Constitutions. Concerning the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons ordained by *Constantine*, it was declared, that their Ordina-

tion was null, and that they should remain in the same Degree of the Clergy in which they were before, unless they should afterwards think it fit to ordain them anew; and, as to the Laymen which had been ordained Deacons and Priests by *Constantine*, that they should wear the Religious Habit during the rest of their Life. Lastly, all that *Constantine* had done was declared null, except Baptism and Confirmation. Consequent to this Decree, the Bishops ordained by *Constantine*, having got themselves to be chosen by the Clergy, and the People, were re-ordained by *Stephen*. The Council treated also of Images; and maintain'd the Worshipping of them against the Council holden in *Greece*. Things being thus ordered, *Stephen* remained in the quiet Possession of the Holy See. But he had some Difference with the King of the *Lombards*, about the Archbishoprick of *Ravenna*, which became vacant by the Death of *Sergius*. The King of the *Lombards* had put one named *Michael* in his room. *Stephen* would have deprived him as an Intruder, and he was at last deposed and sent to *Rome* by the Order of *Charles* King of *France*. But *Desiderius* caused *Christopher* and *Sergius* to have their Eyes put out, for summoning of him in the Pope's Name, to restore to the Church what belong'd to her, yea, and put *Christopher* to Death. This Pope wrote three Letters. The 1st is directed to the Queen, or to King *Charles*; he thanks the King there for the good Turns *Itherius*, his Envoy, had done him; and desires him to give him a Reward. The 2^d is to *Charles* and *Carloman*; he congratulates their Reconciliation, and desires them to force the *Lombards* to restore what they had taken from the Church's Patrimony. The 3^d directed to the same, is to dissuade them from marrying *Desiderius*'s Daughter, or from bestowing their Sister upon his Son. This Letter is very earnest and vehement. There be two Letters more of this Pope in the *Caroline Code*; the 1st which is the 46th of this Collection, is directed to *Bertrade*, and is written against *Sergius*, *Christopher*, and those others, who would have assassinated *Stephen*. The other is a Letter of Thanks to *Carloman*. There are also found there two Letters of *Constantine*, directed to *Pepin*: In the 1st of which he acquaints him with *Paul*'s Death, and promises to be obedient to him. In the 2^d he assures him, he was chosen against his Will; and tells him, that he hath received a Letter from the East about Images, of which he sends him a Copy. *Stephen* died the last Day of January. 772.

ADRIAN I.

Adrian I. *Adrian* was elected and consecrated Bishop of *Rome* by the unanimous Consent of the whole Clergy and People of *Rome* (An. 772. Feb. 9.) In the beginning of his Pontificate *Desiderius* King of the *Lombards* sought his Friendship: But seeing that King had been perjur'd all-a-long, he would not at first give Ear to his Ambassadors; yet he was prevail'd with at last by their Oaths, and sent Deputies to him; but they were hardly got out of *Rome*, when News was brought that *Desiderius* had invaded the Dukedom of *Ferraria*, and the Exarchate of *Ravenna*, and that he was ready to besiege that City. The Pope having sent to demand those Countries back again, he promised to restore them, if he would come to him: But *Adrian* would not put himself into his Hands, and therefore declared, that he would not go to him, before he had restored what he had taken from the Church. *Desiderius* seeing he could do nothing by Fraud and Cunning, attack'd him openly, and prepared himself to besiege the City of *Rome*. In this Extremity the Pope applied himself to *Charles* King of *France*, and sent to intreat him to help the Romans, after the Example of his Father *Pepin*. He would have done it immediately, had not *Desiderius* born him in hand by his Euvoy, that he had restored all to the Church of *Rome*, at that very time when he was drawing near to *Rome*, to besiege it. *Charles* hearing of it, came into *Italy* with an Army, summon'd the King of *Lombardy* several times, to give the Church of *Rome* her Right. The King always denied it; but at last, his Men being taken with a panick Fear, he was forced to withdraw into *Pavia*, and his Son *Adalgisus* to *Verona*. During this time the Pope recovered the Dukedom of *Spoleto*, and great part of the Country which the *Lombards* had taken. On the other side, *Charles* besieged the Cities of *Verona* and *Pavia*; the first yielded presently, he left his Army before the other and went to *Rome*, where he was received by the Pope and the Romans, in a manner suitable to so signal a Service as that he did them. He confirmed the Donation his Father had made to the Holy See, of the Towns and Territories taken by Conquest from the *Lombards*, and promised to preserve them to it. From *Rome* he returned to the Siege of *Pavia*, which he took soon after: He took *Desiderius* Prisoner, and conquered the whole Kingdom of the *Lombards*. From this time *Adrian* continued in the peaceable possession of the Roman

Church, and of the Countries the Kings of *France* had bestowed on him. He laid out his Wealth in building, adorning and beautifying the Churches of *Rome*. He was Pope 23 Years, 10 Months and a few Days: This is the Sum of this Pope's Letters to *Charles* the Great, which are found in a Manuscript of the *Vatican*, and have been put out by *Gretser*, but without observing any Order of the times. The first Numbers note the Order of the *Vatican* Manuscript, and the second the Number of the *Caroline* Book.

I. 88. He congratulates *Charles*'s Conquest of *Bavaria*, and gives him notice, that *Arichisius*, Duke of *Beneventum*, hath sent to *Constantinople*, to demand Aid, with the Dukedom of *Naples* and the Patrician Dignity, upon Promise to obey the *Greek* Emperor, to be clad after the *Grecian* Way, and to follow their Usages. But the Ambassadors sent by the Emperor found *Arichisius* dead: But the People of *Beneventum* had promised the *Greeks* to perform these Conditions, since *Charles* has granted them *Grimoaldus* for their Duke, and they had led their Ambassadors to *Naples*. He desires *Charles* to take his Measures accordingly, and discovers to him the Snares laid by the *Neapolitans* and the People of *Benevent*, for those whom he had sent.

II. 87. He grants the Pall to *Ermembert*, Archbishop of *Bourges*, at *Charles*'s Request.

III. 86. He gives him notice of the Snares the *Greeks* had laid for him; he prays him to keep his Armies always in Readiness. He complains, that his Envoys have not fully executed his Orders concerning the Towns he was to deliver again to the *Roman* Church: He says, that *Grimoaldus* and the *Greeks* take from thence an Occasion of insulting over him.

IV. 85. He writes an Answer to *Charles*, about the Bishops of *Lombardy*, who did incroach upon the Dioceses of other Bishops; about *Ermanald*'s Daughter, which married after having taken the Religious Habit; and about *Simony*, very rife in *Italy* and *Tuscany*. He complains of the Disobedience of the People of *Ravenna* and the *Pentapolis*. He desires *Charles* not to countenance them, and not to receive those that are come to him without his Orders, as he receives none of the King's Subjects, that bring no Orders from their Master.

V. 84. He acquaints him, that according to his Orders, he commanded the *Venetian* Merchants to be banished out

of *Ravenna* and the *Pentapolis*. He desires him to apprehend *Adrian I.* the Duke of *Garenne*, who had possessed himself of some Lands belonging to the Church of *Ravenna*.

VI. 83. He recommends the Duke *Paul*, who went to him, to clear himself from the Accusations charged upon him and the Duke *Constantine*.

VII. 82. He saith, he hath sent him *St. Gregory's* Sacramentary.

VIII. 81. He tells him, he hath set up in the Church the Cross he sent him. He prays him to send Commissioners to restore some Towns of the Dukedom of *Beneventum* to him, with the Territories of *Popolo* and *Roselle*.

IX. 80. He speaks of the Penance to be imposed upon the *Saxons*, who being baptized, had lapsed again into Idolatry.

X. 79. He intercedes for the Abbot of *St. Vincent*, falsely accused to *Charles*.

XI. 78. He forbids Bishops and Presbyters to bear Arms, and gives him notice, that upon his Recommendation he hath set at Liberty *John* the Monk, accused of bearing false Witnesses.

XII. 77. He says, that *Charles's* Envoy could not procure the entire Restitution of the Territory of *Sabina*.

XIII. 67. He speaks to him of the Presents he sent him.

XIV. 66. He prays him to send a new Commissioner, to cause the whole Territory of *Sabina* to be restored to him.

XV. 69. He requests him again to cause that whole Country to be restored to him.

XVI. 68. He begs of him some Beams and Pewter, and gives him notice of the War of *Arichisus* against the *Amalfricans*, and of the Defeat of his Troops by the *Neapolitans*.

XVII. 65. He assures him of the Continuation of their Prayers for him. He tells him, that the Slaves sold to the *Saracens* were sold by the *Lombards* and the *Greeks*. He says, the *Roman* Priests are not guilty of the Crimes they are charged with.

XVIII. 64. He says, that the *Neapolitans* and the *Greeks* had made themselves Masters of *Terracine*, by the Advice of Duke *Arichisus*. He desires *Charles* to send *Wolfini* to retake that Town, and the other Church Lands in the *Neapolitan* Territory.

XX. 62. He tells him, he prays to God Night and Day for him.

XXI. 61. He begs some Beams and Lead to repair the Church of *St. Peter*. He says, he durst not meddle with the Holy Corpse, which *Adon* had begged of him, and gives him a hint of one, which was at the Archbishop *Vulcharius's*; viz. the Body of *St. Candidus* the Martyr.

XXII. 60. He gives him notice of the Emperor *Constantine's* Death. He charges the Duke *Clusus* with seizing of Church Lands, and intreats *Charles* to remove him out of *Tuscany*.

XXIII. 59. He acquaints him with a Plot made to besiege the City of *Rome*.

XXIV. 92. He tells him, that his Envoys fared worse for not following his Advice; and that the *Greeks* were forming a Design to deprive *Charles* of his Dukedom of *Beneventum*.

XXV. 58. He complains that King *Charles's* Commissioners had slighted him, and that instead of coming to *Rome*, they were gone to *Spoletto* and *Beneventum*. He desires *Charles* to put him in possession of the Dukedom of *Spoletto*, as he had promised him.

XXVI. He says, no body did question but that the whole Country of *Sabina* should belong to him.

XXVII. He congratulates the Victory he had lately obtained, and recommends an Abbot and two Bishops to him.

XXVIII. 54. He tells him, that in *Italy* and *Tuscany* there were some *Lombard* Bishops, who invaded the Dioceses of others; that there are some Monks, who laid aside their Habit, to lead a Secular Life and to marry. He speaks again of *Ermenald's* Daughter, and desires *Charles* to stop these Disorders.

XXIX. He complains of the Bishop of *Ravenna's* Impudence, who detained the Towns of *Æmilia* and the *Pentapolis*, after *Charles's* Departure.

XXX. 51. He sends him a Letter of the Patriarch of *Grado*, and complains that the Bishop of *Ravenna* had opened it and read it.

XXXI. 51. He intreats *Charles* to remember his Promises to him, and demands all the Countries which the *Lombards* did once possess.

XXXII. 50. He complains, that he hath waited in vain for the Commissioners that were to come with *Andrew*. He complains, that *Leo* Bishop of *Ravenna* did boast of having obtain'd of him the Towns of the *Pentapolis* and *Æmilia*.

XXXIII. 93. He speaks of his Loyalty and Amity to him. He rejoices because he wrote to him that he would come into *Italy*. He complains of his detaining his Legate *Anastafius* in *France*. He accuses two Persons about him of being his Enemies.

XXXIV. 49. He speaks of some Advantage gotten by the *Persians* upon the *Greeks*.

XXXV. 76. He prays him to cause all the Lands, which he pretends the *Lombards* had taken from the *Roman* Church, to be restored to him.

XXXVI. 77. He prays again, that the Territory of *Sabina* be wholly put into his Hands again. He rejects an Abridgment of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which was brought to him.

XXXVII. 75. He intreats him to continue his constant Affection to the *Roman* Church. He accuses two private Persons who had fled to *Charles*, and desires him to send them to him.

XXXVIII. 74. He recommends the Deputies of the Monastery of *St. Hilary* to him, and prays him not to suffer that the Hospitals built in the Road of the *Alpes* be seized to entertain Travellers.

XXXIX. 71. He answers him about the Elections of the Bishops of *Ravenna*, that they ought to be performed by the Clergy and the People of the Town, in the Presence of the Emperor's Commissioners, and with the Bishop of *Rome's* Consent.

XL. 72. He acquaints him, how he hath composed the Differences of the Monks of *St. Vincent*; and how that the Abbot *Pothon* was resolved to go to him with some Monks, to purge himself from the things laid to his Charge.

XLI. 71. He thanks *Charles* for all his Pains, that he had been at to serve the Church of *Rome*.

XLII. 70. He gives him notice, that *Adalgisus*, *Desiderius's* Son, was come to *Calabria*, and he desires *Charles* to make War on him, and to constrain those of the Country of *Beneventum* to obey him. He cautions him not to make *Grimald* Duke of *Beneventum*, and demands of him the Restitution of *Ravenna*, *Roselle* and *Popolo*.

XLIII. He tells him, that he hath received the Ambassa- [* *Offa* the dors of *Offa**, the *English* King, together with *Charles's* King of Commissioners; and he intimates to him, that he does not the Mer- believe that *Offa* hath suggested any thing against *Charles*. cians.]

XLIV. He appoints Litanies to be said for 3 Days together, in all the *West*, for the happy Conversion of the *Saxons*, wrought by *Charles*.

57. He tells him, that the *Greeks* have put out the Eyes of *Maurice*, Bishop of *Isria*, because of his Faithfulness to the Church of *Rome*. He prays *Charles* to order the Duke of *Aquileia* to get him restored.

75. He acquaints him, that he, with all his Clergy and Monks, prays to God to grant him the Victory against the *Agarenians*.

The 95th. is directed to *Egila*, who had been ordained Bishop, and sent into *Spain* by *Vulcharius*, for accepting a Mission without having any particular See: He commends his Zeal, and exhorts him to follow the Usage of the *Roman* Church in the *Saturday* Fast.

In the 96th. directed to the same Bishop, and to *John* a Presbyter, he exhorts them to a Conformity to the Usages of the *Roman* Church. He confutes the Practice of the *Spanish* Churches, which put off *Easter* to the 8th. Day, when the 14th. Moon fell on *Saturday*. He reports a long Passage of *St. Fulgentius* about Predestination. He condemns some Errors about Free-will, and the Relicks of *Priscillianism*, and reproves some Abuses. Afterwards he was displeased with *Egila*, for teaching some Errors, and neglecting his Ministry.

The 77th. Letter is directed to all the Bishops of *Spain*: In it he treats of *Felix* and *Elipandus's* Error. 2. Of the keeping of *Easter*. 3. Of Predestination. 4. Of the Obligation to abstain from Blood. 5. Of the Commerce and Marriage with *Pagans* and *Jews*, and of the Women that marry again during the Life of their first Husbands.

Flodoard mentions a Letter of this Pope to *Tilpin*, Archbishop of *Rheims*; in which having described the Disorders that had happened in that Church, he confirms to him the Right of Metropolitan or Primate, and grants him the Privilege of not being judged but by a Canonical Judgment, and by the Pope, if in the very Judgment he did appeal to the Holy See. This Letter seems doubtful to me.

Adrian gave to *Charlemagne* the Code of *Dionysius Exiguus*, of whose Canons there was a Summary made, bearing unfitly the Name of this Pope. Some attribute to him a Collection of 72 or 80 Capitula's, which they suppose him to have given to *Ingilram*, Bishop of *Metz*, or *Ingilram* to have presented them to him, for both these are found in the Manuscripts: It contains 72 or 80 Articles of Ecclesiastical Judgments, for the most part taken out of the ancient Canons, Popes Letters, and the *Theodosian Code*; but some Additions are made to them, favourable to the Pretensions of the Court of *Rome*. This Piece was forged when the false Decretals were made, and perhaps by the same Author. They talk also of a Privilege granted by this Pope to the Monastery of *St. Denys*, wherein it is permitted them to have a Bishop: But this also is visibly supposititious.

PAUL Deacon of Aquileia.

PAUL Deacon of Aquileia, called *Winfred* after the Name of his Family, Son of *Wartfred* and *Theodolinda*, was Secretary to *Desiderius*, the last King of the Lombards. This Prince being taken (Anno. 774.) by *Charlemagne*, and his Kingdom utterly destroyed, *Paul* the Deacon fell into the Conqueror's Hands, who used him very civilly. But his Ties to his Prince having brought him into a Suspicion of some Conspiracy, he was banished into an Island of the *Adriatick* Sea, [called *Diomedea*] from whence he escaped to [Anchis] the Duke of *Beneventum*, *Desiderius*'s Son-in-Law, and a little after made himself a Monk in *Mount-Cassin*, where he died in the Beginning of the 9th. Century.

This Author wrote * the History of the Lombards, divided into 6 Books. They do moreover falsely attribute to him an Abridgment of the Roman History drawn out of several Authors: For, tho' he made an Addition to *Entropius*'s Epitome, he is not the Author of that Collection, which is rather *Anastadius*'s the Library-keeper. He abridged the History of the first Bishops of Metz, which Abridgment is found among the Historiographers of France, and in the last Edition of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* [Tom. 13.] The first times of this History, which he brings up to the Apostles, are altogether fabulous. He made this Writing,

as he tells us himself (Ch. 16 B. 6. of his History of the Lombards) at the Request of *Ingilram*, Bishop of Metz. He composed also, in particular, the Life of St. *Arnulphus*, Bishop of Metz, which is found among *Bede*'s Works. There is a Relation of St. *Cyprian*'s Martyrdom; under his Name, which is found at the Beginning of this Father's Works, of *Pamelinus*'s Edition. They published, moreover, under his Name, the Lives of St. *Benedict*, St. *Maurus*, and St. *Scholastica*. *Sigebert* assures us, he wrote the Life of St. *Gregory* the Great, which was printed in the last Edition of that Saint's Works. Besides, they ascribe to him a Commentary upon St. *Benedict*'s Rule, which is not printed. There be some Hymns and Homilies, both manuscript and printed, bearing his Name. It is thought, that St. *John*'s Hymn, *Ut queant laxis*, &c. is his. Lastly, he composed, by *Charlemagne*'s Order, a Book of Homilies or Lessons, gathered out of the Holy Fathers for all the [Festival] Days of the Year. This Book was printed at *Spire*, [An. * 1472.] by *Peter Drach*, with a Letter of *Charlemagne*, at the Beginning of it, declaring that this Work was composed by *Paul* the Deacon, by his Order. *F. Mabillon* hath printed this Letter and some Extracts of the Commentaries of the first Homilies, because the Edition of *Spire* is grown very scarce.

CHARLEMAGNE.

THE Emperor *Charlemagne* may be rank'd among the Latin Ecclesiastical Authors, as well as *Constantine* among the Greeks: For he did not only labour in the re-establishing the Church Discipline, but moreover he made several Laws, wrote Letters, and caused some Treatises of Ecclesiastical Matters to be composed.

Charlemagne's Laws, about Ecclesiastical Matters, are called *Capitularia*, Capitularies. They contain'd some Constitutions made by Councils and confirmed by this Prince, or some Laws made by the sole Authority of this Prince.

The first Capitulary of *Charlemagne* is of the Year 769. it contains 18 Articles about the Manners of the Clergy. It forbids Ecclesiastical Persons bearing of Arms and hunting. It enjoins Priests to be subject to their Bishops, to give them an Account of their Conduct every Year in *Lent*; to take no Church without the Consent of the Bishop upon whom it depends; to take care to administer the Sacraments to the Penitents and to the Sick, and let no body die without the Unction, Reconciliation and the Viaticum; not to say Mass but in Churches dedicated to our Lord, and upon Stone Altars consecrated by the Bishop. It charges Bishops to look carefully after their Dioceses, to obviate Superstitions, to visit every Year. It forbids Judges to punish or condemn the Clergy without the Bishop's Consent.

The 2d. Capitulary is dated in the Year 779. it was made in an Assembly of Bishops, Abbots and Lords. About Ecclesiastical Matters it ordains, that the Suffragan Bishops shall be subject to their Metropolitans; that Bishops shall be ordained in those Towns where there were none before; that in Monasteries the Rule shall be observed; that the Bishops shall have a full Power over the Presbyters and other Clerks; that they shall be impowered to punish incestuous Persons, and to order the Life of Widows; that they shall neither entertain nor ordain the Clerks of other Bishops; that every one shall pay Tythes, which shall be distributed by the Bishop's Order; that the Church shall not protect Murderers, tho' they have fled into Churches, and that they shall give them no Meat there.

They ordered also, in this Assembly, the manner of praying for the Prince, as follows: That every Bishop shall sing three Masses and three Psalters; the 1st. for the King, the 2d. for the Army, and the 3d. for the present Calamity: That Presbyters shall say three Masses, and the Monks, Nuns and Canons three Psalters. Besides, that the Bishops, the Abbots and Abbesses, that are rich, shall bestow upon the Poor one Pound of Silver, or the Worth of it; that those, who are not rich enough, shall feed some poor Folks; that the Earls shall also give a Pound of Silver, and the rest proportionably.

In the Capitulary of the Year 788. there is but one Article concerning Ecclesiastical Matters, whereby Bishops are forbidden entertaining the Clerks of another Bishop, without his Consent.

The 1st. Capitulary of *Aix-la-Chapelle* of the Year 789. is prefaced with a Letter directed to all Ecclesiastick and Secular Persons, exhorting them to watch over their Flocks, to instruct them in the Definitions of the Holy Councils; and declaring to them, that he sends them some Capitularies drawn out of the Canonical Constitutions. The 58th. Chap-

ters are taken out of the ancient Councils and Decrees of Popes, and the 22 next, are new Constitutions, wherein he forbids Perjuries, Witchcrafts, Murders, false Witnesses; and recommends Peace, Patience, Submission to lawful Powers, Reverence in Churches, Order in the Divine Service, Rule in Monasteries, Vigilance and Learning in the Pastors, and particularly the use of the Roman way of Singing, which *Pepin* had with much ado brought into the Churches of France.

The 2d. Capitulary is of the same Year, containing 16 Rules for Monks.

The 3d. comprehends some Rules of Policy, and, among the rest, that in the Administration of Baptism they all follow the Roman Usage; That Bells shall not be baptized; That Monks shall not meddle with Secular Affairs, &c.

There is a particular Capitulary for the Saxon Converts, containing 34 Chapters.

The 8th. condemns to death those Saxons that will not get themselves baptized. The 6th. and 7th. grant the Tythes of all to the Churches. The 18th. forbids keeping Courts on Sundays and Holy-days. The 19th. ordains, That Children shall be brought to Baptism within the Year. There are several against Superstitions, and some for Ecclesiastical and Civil Policy.

The Capitulary of the Year, 793. is for Italy, it contains 17 Chapters. The 1st. permits the Laity to govern the Hospitals founded by them; But it forbids them to govern the Churches, wherein Baptism is administered. The other Chapters concern Civil Matters.

The Capitulary of *Francfort* of the year 794. was drawn in the Synod; it contains 51 Chapters. By the 1st. *Charles* grants *Tassilon*, Duke of *Bavaria*, his Pardon. By the 4th. it is ordain'd, that the Bishops shall do Justice to the Clergy, and their Judgments shall be obey'd. By the 5th. it is ordain'd, That the Bishop shall not run from Town to Town; but shall settle in his own Church, and take care of it. By the 6th. they compose the Difference between the Bishops of *Vienna* and of *Arles*, according to the Pope's Letters; and they grant five Suffragan Sees to that of *Vienna* and nine to that of *Arles*. As for *Tarentaise*, *Ambrun* and *Aix*, they ordain, That they shall send to the Pope about them, and shall follow his Judgment thereupon. In the 7th. they ordain, That a Bishop, suspected of Infidelity, shall clear himself by taking God to witness of his Innocency. By the 8th. they depose *Gerbodius*, who called himself Bishop, without any Proofs or Witnesses of his Ordination, and had been ordained Deacon and Priest, contrary to the Canons. The eight following Canons are concerning Monks and Abbots. The 17th. forbids Clerks to go to a Tavern. The 18th. enjoins Bishops to know the Canons. The 19th. is for the observation of Sunday. The 20th. prohibits ordaining Bishops in Burroughs. The 21st. prohibits ordaining a Slave without his Master's consent. The 22d. enjoins Clerks and Monks to continue in their Profession. The 23d. renews the order for the paying of Tythes. The 24th. ordains, that Churches shall be repair'd by those that enjoy the Benefices. The 25th. That no strange Clerks shall be received without Letters from their Bishop. The 26th. That no Body shall be ordained without a Title to a Benefice. The 27th. That the Bishop shall instruct his People. The 28th. That he shall

Charle-
magne.

be Judge of the Differences between Clerks. The 29th. that there shall be no Cabals among them. The 30th. That Monasteries shall be under Discipline. The 31st. That all the Faithful shall learn the Creed and the Faith of the Church. The 32^d. That Avarice and Covetousness shall be avoided. The 33^d. That Hospitality shall be exercised. The 34th. That Infamous Persons shall not be Accusers. The 35th. That they shall reconcile in case of Necessity. The 36th. That the Clerks of the King's Chappel shall not communicate with those Clergymen which are at odds with their Bishops. The 37th. That the Bishop shall judge the Presbyters found delinquent. The 38th. That he shall take care of Orphan Girls. The 39th. That he shall not stay above three Weeks out of his Diocess, and that the Church-lands of a Bishop deceased, shall belong to his Successor, as his Patrimonial-land to his Heirs. The 40th. That they shall worship no new Saints, nor build any Chappel in the High-ways to their Honour; but those only shall be honoured, which have been chosen because of their Martyrdom or the Merits of their good Life. The 41st. That the Trees and Groves, consecrated to the Pagan Deities shall be cut down. The 42^d. That they shall stand to the Sentence of Umpires chosen. The 43^d. That Children shall not be brought to the Sacraments. The 44th. That they shall observe the Canons concerning the manner of veiling Virgins. The 45th. That those Abbesses shall be deposed, which live disorderly. The 46th. That the Bishop shall distribute the Oblations made in Churches. The 47th. That no Body shall be ordained Priest, before he be 30 years old. The 48th. That after Mass, they shall give one another the kiss of Peace mutually. The 49th. That the Names shall not be recited before the Oblation. The 50th. That we must not believe that Man cannot pray to God, but in 3 Languages only, because God may be worshipped in all sorts of Languages, and he understands all our Petitions. The 51st. That the Bishops and Presbyters shall not be ignorant of the Canons. The 52^d. That Churches cannot be sold to prophane uses. In the 53^d. The Synod assents, That the Emperor may keep the Bishop *Hildebold* in his Court, as he did *Ingilram* already. In the 54th. he recommends *Alcuin* to the Prayers of the Synod, as a Man very well seen in Ecclesiastical Matters.

The Capitulary for the Saxons of the year 797 given in an Assembly of Bishops and Lords, contains nothing but Articles meerly civil.

An. 799. *Charlemagne* sent two Persons to *Rome*, to Pope *Leo III.* to consult him about the *Chorepiscopi* and the Punishment of wicked Priests; he wrote to his Bishops also about it; and we have a Fragment of that Letter with Chapters brought over from *Rome*, for the abolishing of the *Chorepiscopi*.

An. 800. or thereabouts, he set out an Edict, wherein he charges the Counts and other Judges to afford the Bishops their helping Hand for the Execution of the Constitutions made about Ecclesiastical Discipline.

Some time after he made a Capitulary to recommend the reverencing of the Holy Apostolick See in Honour of St. *Peter's* Memory.

There is another Capitulary yet of the year 801. containing 22 Chapters drawn by the Bishops, and confirmed by the King's Authority. The 1st. and the 2^d. import, That the Priests shall pray for the Health and Prosperity of the King and the Royal Family, and for their Bishop. The 3^d. That they shall take care of the Church and the Relicks. The 4th. That they shall preach every Sunday and Holy-day. The 5th. That they shall learn the People the Creed and the Lord's Prayer. The 6th. and 7th. That Tythes shall be paid, and one part shall be bestowed upon Church-ornaments, another upon the Poor, and the third upon Ecclesiasticks. The 8th. That Divine Service shall be perform'd at convenient hours. The 9th. That they shall not celebrate Mass but in consecrated Churches. The 10th. and 11th. That Baptism shall not be administred but at the appointed times, excepting Children, which may be baptized at any time. The 12th. That they shall exact nothing for the administration of Sacraments. The 13th. That Presbyters dwell in the Church where they were ordained. The 14th. and 15th. That Clerks shall be free. The 16th. That they shall have no strange Woman in the House with them. The 17th. That he that had the possession of a Church during the space of 30 years, shall continue in the peaceable possession of it. The 18th. and the next, That Clerks shall carry no Weapons with them, that they shall not meddle with Law-suits; that they shall not go to the Tavern, that they shall forbear Swearing. The 21st. That they shall impose Penance upon those that shall confess to them, and shall grant the *Viaticum* and the Communion to the Sick. The 22^d. That they shall give the Unction to the Sick.

The 1st. Capitulary of the Year 802. given by the King to his Commissaries, contains some Articles of the Life and Manners of the Clergy, of Abbots and Religious Persons.

The other Chapters, and the 2^d. Capitulary of the same year, are upon civil Matters.

The Capitulary of the Year 803. was made in the Synod held by *Paul* of *Aquileia* at *Aix-la-Chapelle*; it contains 7

Articles. The 1st. provides for the preservation of Church-lands. The 2^d. is for the restoring the Election of Bishops by the People and Clergy. The 3^d. prohibits incroaching upon Church's Lands and Privileges. The 4th, 5th, and 6th. declare the Ordinations, Imposition of Hands and Consecrations made by the *Chorepiscopi* to be void. The last is concerning the Judgment of Presbyters. There be also two Capitularies more made a little after upon this Article.

The 3^d. Capitulary of the same year, contains only two Articles upon Ecclesiastical Matters. The 1st. imports, that Churches shall be repaired, and that in those places which have more Churches than needs, some of them shall be pulled down to build up others, where they shall be needful. The 2^d. That none shall be ordained Priest before he be examined, and no Excommunication shall be pronounced without cause.

The 5th. of the same year contains one whereby it is forbidden to give or take any thing for the Holy Chrism.

The 8th. given at *Worms* in the same year, is an Edict for the exemption of Bishops and Priests.

An. 804. He made at *Salz* eight Articles for the Bishops.

By the 1st. they are charged to take care of the Churches of their Diocess. By the 2^d. and 3^d. he preserves the Tythes to the Parochial Churches. The 4th. imports, that the Bishops shall take care to ordain Priests. The 5th. forbids secular Persons to go into Nunneries, and Clerks also, except in case of necessity, and by the Bishops order. The 6th. forbids Nuns to have, in their Monasteries, any other Girls but such as design to stay there. The 7th. and 8th. forbid admitting Male-children thereinto, or carrying Arms thither. These Articles are back'd with the following Advertisements to Presbyters, to preach and teach the Scripture and the Creed; to be able to say the Psalter without Book, as also the words for administring Baptism; to be skilful in the Canons and the Penitential; and in Singing; not to dwell with Women, except their Mother, Sister or Aunt; not to go to the Tavern; not to be Covetous, Drunkards or Idle; not to break the Fast of Holy Thursday; not to administer the Holy Chrism and to come to the Synod.

An. 805. He made a Capitulary of 16 Articles at *Thionville*, containing several Rules of Ecclesiastical Policy: Some Articles of it are also found in the second and third Capitularies.

In the Articles given the same year to *Jesse*, Bishop of *Amiens*, the 2^d. imports, that no Layman shall be Superior of Monks nor Archdeacon.

There's an Edict of the same year, and in the same place, about the Reverence due to Bishops and Priests.

The 5th. Capitulary of the year 806. contains several Constitutions of Ecclesiastical Policy.

The 6th. renews some ancient Canons about Discipline.

The 2^d. Article of the 1st. Capitulary of 809. discharges the Priest from administring the Holy Chrism.

The 5th. of the 1st. Capitulary of 810. enjoins them to preach and instruct the People.

The 1st. and 2^d. Capitularies of 811. contain excellent Instructions of the duty of Abbots, Monks, Clerks and Bishops.

The Capitulary of 813. contains 28 Articles, made in the Councils of *Arles* and *Mentz*, and confirmed by the Authority of *Charlemagne*, about Church Discipline and the Manners of the Clergy.

Lastly, besides these Capitularies of *Charlemagne*, of which we know the time, there are also 5 Capitularies more, of which the Time is unknown; they contain several Constitutions, which are almost contain'd in the Capitularies above-mention'd.

Most of the Capitularies of *Charlemagne* concerning Ecclesiastical Matters, have been collected in the first of the four Books of Capitularies composed by *Ansegisus*, (according to some Abbot of *Lobbes*, and according to M. *Baluzius*, Abbot of *Fontenelles*) whose Collection was approved by *Lewis* the Meek, and by *Charles* the Bald. This Abbot undertook to set in order, and to collect the Constitutions contain'd in the Capitularies of *Charlemagne*, and *Lewis* the Meek, made before 828. The first of the four Books of his Collection contains *Charlemagne's* Ecclesiastical Constitutions; The 2^d. the Civil Laws of the same Emperor; The 3^d. the Ecclesiastical Constitutions of *Lewis* the Meek; and the last the Civil Laws of the same. After him, *Benedict*, Deacon of *Mentz*, gathered about the Year 845. some Capitularies of those two Emperors, omitted by *Ansegisus*, and added thereto the Capitularies of *Carloman* and *Pepin*; but his Collection published in three Books, is very much confused. These two Collections are the seven Books of the Capitularies of our Kings. The six first Books were set out in 1548. by *Tilins*, Bishop of *Meaux*; and the seven Books altogether have been published by M. *Pithaus*, in the end of the last Century, and in the beginning of this. Since 1545. they had printed in *Germany* some Capitularies, and in 1557. several had been printed at *Basil*, but all those Editions were imperfect and defective, and we are obliged to M. *Baluzius* for having procured us such a fair Edition of the

Charle-
magne.

Charle-
magne.

Capitularies, very large and full, and revised by several Manuscripts, with all the Care and Application imaginable. It came forth in 1677. from *Muguet's* Press, in two Volumes *Fol.* The first of which comprehends the Capitularies of the Kings *Childebert, Clotharius, Dagobert, Carloman, Pepin, Charlemagne*, of *Pepin King of Italy* and *Lewis the Meek*, together with the seven Books of Capitularies, collected by *Ausegius* and *Benedict*, four Additions to these Collections, the Canons of *Isaac Bishop of Langres*, taken out of the three last Books of Capitularies, and the Chapters of *Herard Archbishop of Tours*, taken also out of our King's Capitularies. The second Volume contains the Capitularies of *Charles the Bald*, and the posterior Emperors, with divers Forms.

These Capitularies renew the ancient Church Discipline in many Points, and in the other establish one suitable to the Necessity and the Manners of the Age, and against the most common Disorders of the Time. They set up again the Bishops Elections, and restored the Church to her former Possessions. They forbade the Laity to encroach upon them, and the Clergy to alienate them. They revived the ancient Laws concerning Ecclesiastical Judgments, the Authority of Metropolitans, and of Provincial Synods, and the Prohibitions of the Canons against encroaching upon other Bishops Dioceses, and receiving their Clerks or Persons excommunicated by them. They did not forget the famous Prohibition so often repeated, for all sorts of Persons in Holy Orders to have no strange Woman in the House with them. They put in force again the Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, whereby it is forbidden to make Ordinations absolute and without Title. They prohibited Translations and Non-residence; the Perseverance of Clerks and Monks was ordained. Clerks were commanded to be subject to their Bishops by several Laws. They ordain'd, that he should have the disposing of all the Benefices in his Diocese, and that no Priest might be put in or out of any Parish or Chappel but by his Authority. They bind the Parsons to go or send to the Episcopal City for the Holy Oyl. The *Choriepiscopi* were forbidden Episcopal Functions, and they endeavoured the total abolishing of them. They charged the Bishops to examine the Doctrine and the Manners of Presbyters before they ordained them; to ordain no body Presbyter, unless he was 30 Years old; they enjoyn'd Presbyters and other Ecclesiastical Persons, to live regularly, to addit themselves to the Offices of their Ministry, and chiefly to Preaching. Priests are forbidden saying Mass without communicating: They were enjoyned to have the Eucharist always ready at hand, to be administered to the Sick, together with the Unction, which was common at this time. Clerks had no other Judges but the Bishops, and they required a great number of credible Witnesses to condemn them. They set up Schools in Bishopricks and Abbies, to learn the Psalms, Singing and Grammar. They endeavoured to destroy the Remains of Pagan Superstitions. The Invocation of Saints (*hh*) was much used; Relicks and the Crofs were revered (*ii*): But in France no Veneration of Images was allowed. The Prohibition of contracting Marriages, was extended to the fourth Degree of Consanguinity; spiritual Affinity (*kk*) began then to take place.

[*hh*] Invocation of Saints.]

In the Days of this Emperor, *Charles the Great*, who flourished towards the latter end of this Century, idolatrous Superstitions and Corruptions were arriv'd at their full growth. Image-Worship was established by Law in the Eastern and Western Churches, and Saint-Worship as our Author says truly, much used: But from the Beginning it was not so: Neither the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, nor yet the purest Antiquity do at all authorize this Practice. Among those excellent Prayers which we meet with in Holy Scripture, composed by Men divinely inspired, we cannot find one directed to any Saint or Angel, nor any other Being whatsoever, but the only living and true God; but we may read in several Places, that both the Angels, and Saints while they were alive, have disclaimed all Worship, when tendered to them, as not due to them; and after their Death we are assured that they cannot hear us. Consonant to these Truths did the Church of Christ for above 200 Years believe and act, and not only make no Prayers to any Angel or Saint, as *Irenaeus* testifies, but shewed a great Abhorrence of all such Hereticks, as used such a sort of Worship. The first step towards it was made by *Origen*, who advanced this Doctrine in the Church, that the Saints departed out of this Life, do carry along with them a Remembrance of the State and Condition of their Brethren, and out of their Love to them do carefully recommend them to God and pray for them. From this Persuasion, (which many learned from him) did the Christians take occasion to intreat their living Friends, who were eminent for Piety, that if they died before them, and so came first into Christ's joyful and happy Presence, they would not forget to recommend them to God, who were left behind in a sinful World: But yet no Saint was invoked or prayed to after Death many Years after this; for *St. Jerome*, *Ambrose*, and *Theodore*, unanimously acknowledge, that God alone is to be worshipped and prayed to; and *St. Austine* expressly

V O L. II.

says, *Non sit nobis Religio cultus hominum mortuorum; Let not the Worship of dead Men be any part of our Religion.* But altho' there was no Invocation of Saints, yet many Doctrines and Practices were allowed and believed, which laid the Foundation of Saint-Worship, which was introduced soon after: As 1. it was held, that the Souls of the Martyrs were every where present, but especially at their Tombs, where several Miracles were wrought. 2. Many of the eminent Fathers both for Learning and Devotion, made rhetorical Panegyrics of the Christians deceased, wherein by *Apostrophe's* and *Prosopopeia's* they seemed to invoke Souls departed. Thus *St. Jerome*, in his Epitaph of *Hier. epit. Paula*, saith, *Farewel, O Paula, and by thy Prayers help the de-eph. Paula. crepis Age of him that honours thee.* And *St. Nazianzen*, in his *Greg. Naz. Invektives against Julian*, saith, *Hear, O thou Soul of great inv. 1. in Constantine, &c.* 3. The Christians in their Prayers, at the Com-*Jul.* memoration of the Memories of the Martyrs, not only used many unwary Expressions, implying a sort of Invocation of them; but did formally pray to God to grant them such Blessings as they stood in need of, thro' their Intercession; for *St. Au- Aug. in fine* says, *We mention not them as though we prayed for them, but that they may pray for us.* These Doctrines and Practices, *Joan. tract 84.* so prepared Mens Minds for the Invocation of Saints, that about the Year 600. *St. Gregory* inserted Petitions to them in the publick Litanies among the *Larins*, as *Petrus Gnaphaus* had some time before among the *Greeks*, and it was quietly received and allowed, and so continued to the times of *Charles the Great*, and downward till the Reformation, without any considerable Opposition: So apt are Men to cherish Will-worship.]

[*ii*] Relicks——reverenced.] Although the Reverence of Bones and other Relicks of Saints seems as absurd a Piece of Idolatrous Worship as the Heathens themselves were guilty of, yet it was the first that crept into the Church through the Policy of Satan, which was effected by this Means: It pleased God, for the Testimony of his Doctrine and Truth, to work great Miracles by the dead Bodies of his Saints, in witness that they had been his Messengers, and Instruments of his Will: But that which was intended by God for the Good of Men and Conversion of Souls, became a Snare to lead them into Error; for their Admiration of the Vertue which God seemed to put into them, stirred them up not only to seek for them, and use them as Amulets and Remedies against all Evils and Distempers, but also made them give them a singular Respect and Veneration, as we may gather from *St. Austine's* Words, *I know many that worship Graves, Images, &c.* Indeed there was a Respect always paid to the Martyrs deceased, by the Christians, by celebrating their Memories at their Tombs, upon the Anniversary of their Martyrdom, and by bestowing a neat and convenient Burial upon them; but it was never allowed by the Orthodox Fathers to give them a Divine Honour: Yea, *St. Gregory* says, *That it is not lawful to bring the Bodies of the Saints into a publick View, or handle them with the Hands.* 'Twas Satan's Subtlety to insinuate Idolatry by an intemperate Devotion.]

[*kk*] Prohibition of Marriage——to the fourth Degree of Consanguinity; spiritual Affinity.] To avoid all incestuous Marriages, such Canons as these, prohibiting Marriage within certain Degrees are very convenient to be imposed, and ought to be observed: And tho' indeed this may seem too strict, restraining such Kindred from Marriage, as the Word of God it self doth seem to permit, *Lev. 18* being extended to the fourth Degree of Consanguinity; yet 'tis better to prohibit something in it self lawful, where there is little or no Inconvenience consequent upon it, than to permit a thing, which in Strictness, perhaps, is lawful, but is in appearance evil and scandalous, as a Marriage Conjunction of Persons near a-kin, is commonly accounted. But as to spiritual Consanguinity or Affinity, as it is no real Relation, so to hinder such as are thus allied from Marriage is an Instance of Papal Tyranny and Usurpation, no Persons being really better qualified for Marriage together, than such as are Brethren and Sisters in the Lord: So that though the Constitution for not marrying to the fourth Degree, is tolerable enough, yet the latter, since it may produce many Inconveniences among Men, deserves no Regard nor Observation; and it is to be believed, that it had long since expired, had it not been much for the Advantage of the Papal Hierarchy, by creating an Abundance of Dispensations.]

The Celebration of *Sundays* was then very solemn. On this Day they did forbear all manner of servile Work, and Christians were obliged to be present at Divine Service, which was solemnly perform'd: The keeping of publick Markets was prohibited on this Day. This is the Number of the Holy Days then kept, set down in the 158th Chapter of the first Book of the Capitularies: The Festivals of *Christmas*, *St. Stephen*, *St. John the Evangelist*, the *Innocents*, the *Octave of the Lord*, the *Epiphany*, the *Octave of the Epiphany*, the *Purification of the Blessed Virgin*, eight Days at *Easter*, the *great Litany*, the *Ascension*, *Whitsunday*, *St. John Baptist*, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, *St. Martin* and *St. Andrew*. As to the Virgin's Assumption, it is said, *We leave it out to enquire into it.* Churches were built with as much Splendor and Magnificence as the Age would permit; they were deck'd and adorn'd, the Altars consecrated and covered with Linen Cloath; the Service was performed with great Pomp. The Roman Way of singing was brought into the Churches

Charles-
magne.

de S. Mart.

ep. 2.

aph. Paula.

Greg. Naz.

inv. 1. in

Aug. in

Joan. tract

84.

Aug. de

Ecclef. c.

Man. c. 34.

Greg. lib. 3.

ep. 30.

Cont. Nic.

2. Act. 7.

Rev. 22. 8.

9.

Act. 10,

25, 26.

Mat. 63. 16.

1 King. 22.

20.

Iren. adv.

Har. lib. 1.

c. 23.

Orig. hom.

3. in cant.

in. c. 13.

Joshua in

Epist. ad

Rom.

Cypr. ep.

57.

Amb. de ob.

Theod.

Hieron. in

Prov. 2.

Theod. com.

in Col. c. 2.

Sulp. Sever.

Charle-
magne. Churches of *France*, but they kept still their own peculiar Way of singing. They took great care of the Church-Books and singing. Women were forbidden to come near the Altars; and Abbesses to give the Blessing, to make the Sign of the Cross upon Mens Heads, and to give the Veil with the sacerdotal Benediction. Simony was severely forbidden. They made Laws against Usury then, not only in Ecclesiastical, but Laymen. There were many Hospitals for the Poor and Sick. The paying of Tythes was become obligatory, and all sorts of Persons were constrained to pay them to Church-men. They were forbidden exacting any thing for the Sacraments, or for Ecclesiastical Offices. Church-Revenues were divided into three Parts; one Part was for the repairing of Churches, the other for the Poor, and the last for Churchmen. They began to oblige the Clergy of Cathedrals to live together canonically. They made divers Constitutions to keep Monks in order. They forbade to receive Children without the Parent's Consent, and to veil Virgins before 30 Years of Age, and Widow-Women before the 30th. Day after their Husband's Decease. They prohibited a sort of Clerks, which wore the Religious Habit, and would live neither as Monks nor Clergymen. The Rectors of Country Parishes came from time to time to give the Bishop an Account of their Conduct; and the Bishop did also visit his Dioceses. Publick Penance was in use yet, but not with the same Rigor as in the former Ages. They granted Absolution several times. They never denied the Communion to dying People. Secret Confessions were frequent. They recommended frequent Communion. They administered yet Baptism by Immersion, and only at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, unless in case of Necessity. Prayer for the Dead was very much practised. This is part of the Discipline contained in *Charlemagne's* Capitularies.

This is the Catalogue of this Emperor's Letters. A Letter to *Offa* King of the *Mercians*, in the Year 774. A Declaration for the Designation of Bishopricks. A Letter to *Fastrade* his Wife. Some Instructions given to *Angilbert*, going to *Rome*, anno 796. A Letter to *Leo*, sent by *Angilbert*. Two Letters to *Offa*. A Fragment of a Letter against vicious Priests, directed to the Bishops of *France*. A Letter to the Monks of *St. Martin of Tours*; wherein he enjoyns them to send back again to *Theodulphus* Bishop of *Orleans*, some Clerks of *Orleans*, who had harboured among them. A Letter for the Restoration of Schools in Churches and Monasteries. A Letter to *Pepin*, for the Peace of the Churches, and

of those who serve them. A Letter to the Bishops of the Kingdom, written in 811. commanding them to instruct the Priests and the People in the Signification of the Ceremonies of Baptism: The Copy we have of it is directed to *Odelbert*; it was set forth by *F. Mabillon*, and is found, as well as the preceding, in the Collection of Capitularies of *M. Baluzius*. This Letter stirred up *Amalarius*, *Jesse*, and some other Bishops to make some Treatises to explain the Right of Baptism. A Letter to *Alcuin*, about the number of the Works in the Year, among *Alcuin's* Works. A Letter which he made for a Preface to the Book of Homilies, made by *Paul* the Deacon, [and collected into one Volume by his Order] set out by *F. Mabillon* in the first Volume of his *Analeceta*, pag. 25. *Sigebert* ranks *Charlemagne* among Ecclesiastical Writers, upon the account of this Work, which yet was none of his, but of *Paul* the Deacon of *Aquileia*. *F. Mabillon* hath moreover set forth, in the fourth Volume of his *Analeceta*, an Epistle of *Charlemagne*, touching the Grace of the * Holy Ghost. Lastly, we meet with several Letters more of *Charlemagne*, as Foundations, Donations, Privileges, &c. in the Collection of such kind of Pieces.

But the two most considerable Ecclesiastical Works that have appeared under this Prince's Name, are the Letter written in his Name to *Elipandus*, Bishop of *Toledo*, and the other Bishops of *Spain*, against the Error of *Felix*, Bishop of *Urgel*, which is at the end of the Council of *Frankfort*; and the four Books called *Caroline*, against Image-Worship, and the Decree of the *Nicene* Council; Some attribute them to *Ingilram*, Bishop of *Metz*, others to *Alcuin*, others would have us think them to be supposititious: But this last Pretension is unwarrantable, for, not to speak of the Authority of *Hincmarus*, who cites them, and of several ancient Authors, which are found in Libraries, Pope *Adrian's* Answer to this Work shews it had been published in his time by *Charlemagne's* Order, and the Councils of *Frankfort* and *Paris* are authentick Testimonies of the Truth of these Books; So that there can be no doubt but this Work is a kind of *Manifesto*, containing the Sentiments of the *French* Church, published under the Name and by the Order of *Charlemagne*. We shall speak more fully of these Works of *Charlemagne*, when we make the History of the seventh Council, and of this of *Frankfort*, where we will examine the Affair of *Felix* of *Urgel*, and the Sentiments of the Author of the *Caroline* Books touching Images.

[* Of the sevenfold Spirit.]

A L C U I N.

Alcuin. **F**laccus, *Albin*, or *Alcuin*, born in *England*, Deacon of the Church of *York*, and the Scholar of *Bede* and of *Egbert*, was invited into *France* (anno 790.) by *Charlemagne*, who looked upon him as his Master, and shewed a great Esteem for him. He had the Reputation of one of the most learned Men of his Age, in Ecclesiastical Matters. He instructed the *French* not only by his Writings, but moreover by the publick Lectures he read in the King's Palace and other Places. *Charles* gave him [the Government of] many Abbies, and at last charged him with the Care of the Canons of *St. Martin of Tours*: He died in this Society, anno 804.

This Author's Works were collected by *Andreas* [*Querquetanus*, or] *du Chefne*, and printed at *Paris* by *Gramoisy* in 1617.

They are divided into three Parts. The 1st. comprehends his Tracts upon the Scripture; the 2d. his Books of Doctrine, Discipline, and Morality; and the 3d. the Verses, Letters, and Poems he made.

The first part comprehends the following Works. Questions and Answers about several difficult Passages of *Genesis*, with an Explication of these Words, *Let us make Man in our Image*. An Exposition of the penitential and gradual *Psalms*, and of the 118th. *Psalms*. A Treatise of the Use of *Psalms*, with Prayers taken out of the *Psalms*. An Office of the Church for the Year. A Letter upon what is said in the *Song of Songs*, that there be sixty Queens, and eighty Concubines. A Commentary upon *Ecclesiastes*, and seven Books of Commentaries upon the Gospel of *St. John*. It is observed in the end of this part, that *Alcuinus* had laboured to correct the whole Text of the Vulgar Bible, by *Charlemagne's* Order, and that this Manuscript Work is found in the Library of *Vauxcelles*, with some Verses of *Alcuinus* upon this Work.

The second part comprehends the following Treatises. A Tract of the Trinity, dedicated to *Charlemagne*, divided into three Books, wherein he handles with great Accuracy and Clearness some speculative and scholastick Questions, concerning those Mysteries, with twenty eight Questions and Answers about the Trinity. A Letter explaining what

is Time, Eternity and an Age, &c. * A Tract of the Soul, directed to his Sister *Eulalia* a Virgin. Seven Books against the Opinion of *Felix*, Bishop of *Urgel*, who believed Jesus Christ might be called the Adoptive Son of God, as to his humane Nature. A Letter upon the same Subject written to *Elipandus*, Bishop of *Toledo*. *Elipandus's* Answer, in which he treats *Alcuin* very rudely, and having loaded him with Calumny, cites some Passages of the Fathers, and the Church-Office, to justify that Jesus Christ may be called God's Adoptive Son, as to his humane Nature. *Alcuin's* Reply to *Elipandus's* Letter, divided into four Books. In the two first he answers the Authorities alledged by *Elipandus*; and in the two last he proves his own Opinion by Testimonies of the Fathers, and the Scripture. He forbears reviling Words, and deals with him with as much Moderation as his Adversary hath expressed himself with Heat and Passion. At the end of these four Books, there is an Advertisement of *Alcuinus* about the Original of *Felix's* Error, and the Retraction made of it; *Elipandus's* Letter to *Felix*; The Confession of Faith he made after his Retraction; and a Letter of *Alcuinus* about the Questions that may be raised touching the Son of God. These are the dogmatical Works contain'd in this second part.

The first of the Works of Discipline is the Book of [the Divine] Offices, bearing *Alcuinus's* Name, but it belongs to a later Author, there being mention made there of *Hilperick*, who lived in the tenth Century; besides, it contains several Observations of a lower Age than that *Alcuin* lived in.

The 2d. Work about Discipline, is *Alcuin's* Letter to *Charlemagne*, upon the *Septuagesima*, *Sexagesima* and *Quinquagesima*; and upon the Differences of the number of the Weeks of *Lent*, with *Charlemagne's* Answer upon the same Subject.

The 3d. is a Tract of *Alcuin*, directed to *Adrian*, upon the Ceremonies of Baptism, which are the same that are practised now, of which he renders moral Reasons.

The 4th. is a Letter * to the Clerks of *St. Martin*, to exhort them to confess their Sins.

Alcuin.
[* In the Biblioth. Patrum it is attributed to *Paulinus* Bishop of *Aquileia* but falsely.]

[* Ad *Pueros S. Martini*, i.e. To the Boys of *S. Martin*. D. Cave.]

The

Alcuin. The 5th. is a Sacramentary, containing Masses for many Festivals of the Year.

These Works are followed with three Homilies upon the Incarnation, the Virgin's Nativity, and the Festival of All-Saints. These three Homilies are taken out of the Book of Homilies of *Paul* the Deacon, and it is not certain that they are *Alcuin's*.

The Life of Antichrist follows, which is full of groundless Fancies. There is but one Work of Morality, which is of Virtues and Vices: The rest are Works upon prophane Arts and Sciences. The Book of the 7 Arts is *Cassiodorus's* Preface upon that Subject.

The last part of *Alcuin's* Works comprehends the following Books.

The Life of St. *Martin* of *Tours*, and a Sermon on his Death.

The Life of St. *Vedastus* of *Arras*.

The Life of St. *Richarius*, a Presbyter.

The Life of St. *Wilbrord*, Bishop of *Utrecht*, in Prose and Verse, with an Homily for his Festival.

One hundred and fifteen Epistles, with the Fragments of some more, taken out of *English* Authors.

Poems upon several Saints.

A Poem upon the meeting of Pope *Leo*, and *Charlemagne*. Divers Poems.

The Letters upon Ecclesiastical Matters are these.

The 2d. of which we have already spoken, about the difference of the number of the Weeks of *Lent*.

The 6th. upon these words of the Gospel, *Here are two Swords*.

The 7th. of the manner of instructing the People in the Faith.

The 8th. in which he speaks against a Letter written to him by *Felix* of *Urgel*, whom he calls Jocosely, *Felix infelix*. But this was retorted upon him by *Elipandus*, who called him several times *Albinus niger*, *Antiphrasius*.

In the 13th. he speaks of a Writing he had made against *Felix* of *Urgel*, and of a Dialogue of that Author between a *Christian* and a *Saracen*.

The 29th. directed to *Osred*, King of *Northumberland*, is full of Instructions very useful for Princes.

The 30th. contains some for a Queen that had retired from the World.

The 31st. is full of Advices to the Canons of *Tours*.

The 32d. to the Bishop *Adelbert* and his Society, contains a commendation of the Life of the Canons Regular, and an Exhortation to follow it.

The 49th. contains the same sort of Exhortations to the Friars of *Wiremouth* and *Jarrow*.

The 50th. to those of *York*.

The 62d. to the Canons of St. *Leger*.

The 63d. is directed to Pope *Adrian*, to whom he writes very submissively.

In the 69th. he exhorts the Canons of *Lyons*, to reject the Errors which are come from *Spain*, to follow the Tradition and Usage of the Universal Church, to avoid the Additions made to the Creed, and the new Customs brought into the Service of the Church. He speaks particularly of their Error, about the Adoption of the Son of God, and the Practice of some, who threw Salt upon Christ's Sacrifice. He maintains, that they ought to offer nothing but Bread, Water, and Wine; that the Bread ought to be very pure, without any mixture, made of Flour and Water. The last thing, he finds fault with, in the Usages introduced in *Spain*, is, that they made but one Immersion, calling upon the Three Persons of the Trinity. He maintains against them the Use of the Triple Immersion, and here he explains the Ceremonies of Baptism; he speaks of the same thing in the 81st. Letter, where he does intimate, that there were some who dipped three times, repeating the Invocation of the Trinity at each time. He reprehends in this Letter, those who doubted, whether the Souls of the Holy Apostles and Martyrs were received up into Heaven before the Day of Judgment. In the 71st. Letter he proves the necessity of Confession.

The 72d. is to Pope *Leo*, whom he calls Vicar of the Apostles, Prince of the Church.

In the 78th. he commends the Monastick Life, and exhorts Monks to discharge the Duties of it.

The 97th. contains excellent Instructions about the Duties of a Bishop.

He treats of Baptism in the 104th.

In the 106th. he answers the Question put to him by *Charlemagne*, which is the Hymn that Jesus Christ said after his last Supper. He pretends, it was the words related by the Evangelists,

Since this Edition there have been printed some more of *Alcuin's* Works; as, a Commentary upon the Song of *Solomon*, at *London* in 1638, [by the care of *Patrick Young*.] An Abridgment of the Faith against the *Arians*, set forth [at *Paris* in 1630,] by *F. Sirmondus*, without the Author's Name, and attributed to *Alcuin* by *F. Chiffletius*, upon the

Authority of some MSS. A long Confession of Faith, divided into four parts, drawn out of the Fathers, published by *F. Chiffletius*, and printed at *Dijon* in * 1656, [but it is dubious whether it belongs to *Alcuin*, or no.] A Discourse of the Purification, which was without Name among St. *Ambrose's* Works, and was restored to *Alcuin* by *M. Baluzius*, in the 2d. Vol. of *Miscellanea*, p. 382. Two Letters set forth by *M. Baluzius* in the same place, [Tom. 1. p. 365.] the one directed to *Charlemagne*, upon the Price of Jesus Christ's Death; the other to the Abbots and Monks of the *Goths*, upon the Unity of the two Natures in the Person of Jesus Christ. There's in the same place a Capitulary, containing sundry Moral Maxims directed to *Charlemagne*; but that Work seems to me unworthy of *Alcuin*. Twenty six Letters published by *F. Mabillon* in the 4th. Vol. of his *Analeccta*, and a Poem, in which he laments the disorders, and looseness of one of his Friends, under the Name of a Cuckow.

The Learned are not all agreed, that the Confession of Faith, set out by *F. Chiffletius*, is *Alcuin's*. The Author of the Office for the Holy Sacrament, in the Historical and Chronological Table of the Authors, hath propounded some difficulties about this Confession of Faith, which might make one doubt, whether it be truly *Alcuin's*. He says, the two first parts of it are very excellent and precious; but there are many things taken out of the other Works of *Alcuin*, especially the different Orations. That the third part does not seem to be coherent to the two first, there being several places in it copied out of them word for word; which probably an Author, whatever he might be, would not have done in the same Work. Besides, that it is almost all of it taken from *Pelagius's* Confession of Faith, and from the Book of the Ecclesiastical Doctrines, yet so, that the *Pelagian* and *Semi-pelagian* Expressions of those Books are commonly left out in it; that there are also some places of it without any rational coherency: And above all, what he set in the end, to join it to the 4th. seems to have been added. That the 4th. part, in what it contains about the Eucharist, is perfectly fine, but doubtless it ends in the first Chapter; all the rest being but a Rhapsody of divers Orations. He confesses the Style of this last part, as well as of the first, does pretty well resemble that of *Alcuin*, which is not always very pure and correct, but very quick and lively. He intimates, that altho' these four Words (*Caro, Cibus, Sanguis, Potus*,) which are found in St. *Thomas's* Prose, are read there, the Thread of his Discourse did so naturally lead him, to use them in that order, that one ought not to conclude, that this Work was made since St. *Thomas's* time. That the Style hath nothing Scholastical, yea, and that it hath some Expressions, which were not used since *Berengarius*, as that the Eucharist is Christ's Body and Blood only for the Just. Lastly, that in this 4th. part there are some places found in the † Book of Divine Offices attributed to *Alcuin*.

Dailleus hath taken affirmatively, what was said but doubtfully by the Author Of the Office of the Holy Sacrament, and he adds new Conjectures, to shew that this Confession was not *Alcuin's*.

The 1st. is grounded upon this, that in this Confession of Faith some things are met with, which are taken word for word out of the Books of the Meditations and the Mirrour, falsely ascribed to St. *Anselm*, and composed since *Alcuin's* time, seeing, that of the Meditations, which is the ancients, was written since St. *Anselm's* time. The 2d. is grounded upon this Work's not being set down in the Index's of *Alcuin's* Works. The 3d. upon this Author's often copying himself, which an Author does not usually do. Moreover he insists upon this, that there is a place in this Book, which is found in the Book of Offices, attributed to *Alcuin*. *Dailleus* pretends, that this Author's Sentiments differ from *Alcuin's*. He says, that explaining the Creation of the World, he relateth the two Opinions related by *Alcuin* also in his Questions upon *Genesis*, but prefers that which was disapproved by *Alcuin*. He adds, that this Author believes the Real Presence, which Sentiment he does not think to be *Alcuin's*; and that he looks upon the contrary Opinion as Heretical. Lastly, He pretends that there be some things in this Work which do not agree with the Ninth Century; as when he complains of the infelicity of his Age, and speaks of the Miracles whereby the Eucharist had been represented under the shape of a Man. * *F. Mabillon* contrary-wise asserts the truth of this Work, chiefly upon the Antiquity of the Manuscript, from which it is taken. He maintains the Characters to be of *Charlemagne's* time, or very near it; and tho' the sole Testimony of a Man, as much conversant in these matters as he was, might be sufficient, he joined to it the Attestation of many Learned Men. The Antiquity of this Manuscript shews, that this Book is of *Alcuin's* time, seeing the Manuscript it self is of that time. 2dly. He notes, that the Ancient Title of this Manuscript was written in Red, and that they only put Ink upon the Ancient Red Characters, which are to this effect; *Albini Confessio Fidei*.

[† In a posthumous Treatise, printed at *Rouan*, an. 1675.]

[* In *Anat.* Tom. 1. p. 178.]

Alcuin. 3dly. He proves that this Author is older than the School-Men, because he does not speak as exactly as they do of the Mysteries, that he always translates *ὁμοούσιος* of the Greeks, by the word *Co-essential*, whereas the School-Men always said *Con-substantial*. He taketh notice of the place, in which he varies from our way of speaking of the Eucharist. He adds, that this Author hath some Opinions which were not common, but in the eighth and ninth Centuries; as when he pretends, that *Catechumens* cannot be saved without either Baptism, or Martyrdom; that the Question of the two Predestinations, which he treats of, was agitated in this Age; that all, that this Author says of himself, agreeth to *Alcuin*. Lastly, To bring in a Witness, he says, that *John Abbot of Fescamp*, who lived in the twelfth Century, hath cited several passages of this Treatise in a Book he made against *Berengarius*.

Having alledged these proofs of the Antiquity of this Book, he clears the difficulties; he says, it's no wonder, this Author should have made Extracts of *Pelagius's* Confession of Faith, seeing it was commonly cited in this time; and was look'd upon as a Work of *St. Hierome*. That it's less to be wondred at, that he should be cited in the Book of *Gennadius's* Ecclesiastical Doctrines, seeing *Adrian* made no difficulty to alledge one Authority out of it. That the passages, which are found in this Confession, are not taken out of the Book of the Meditations, and the Mirrour; but it is the Compilers of those two Works, that have inserted them in two places of *Alcuin's* Treatise, seeing the Manuscript of this Work is doubtless older than the Author of those other Treatises. And if this Confession be not

found in the Catalogues of *Alcuin's* Works, that's not to be wondred at, seeing all those Lists of Catalogues are imperfect; that it is an ordinary thing with the Authors of this Age, and with *Alcuin*, not only to transcribe other Mens, but their own Works also; that the Author of the Book of Offices did transcribe *Alcuin's* Confession of Faith; that it's not true, that *Alcuin's* Opinions about the Eucharist are different from this Author's; that he had Instances to prove, that Jesus Christ hath appeared in the Eucharist in the shape of a Man; that some Authors of the ninth Century, before the Birth and the Condemnation of *Berengarius's* Error, have condemn'd his Opinion as Heretical; that it's no Extraordinary thing for an Author, alledging in two places two different Explications of the same passage, to approve now the one, and then the other; that it were a more extraordinary thing, that two different Authors should bring two like Explications of the same passage; that altho' *Charlemagne's* Age was more Learned than the tenth, yet *Alcuin* Expostulates the infelicity of that time, and the disorders then in the Church, in the Works not doubted of, as in the 6th. Letter, and in his 271st. Poem. And therefore, that there's nothing in the Confession of Faith, bearing his Name, that proves it not to be his. [These Reasons and Solutions, saith *F. Mabelloni*, make it probable, tho' not certain, that this Confession of Faith is *Alcuin's*.] *Alcuin's* Style is neat and lively; he writes wittily, his Expressions are pure enough for his time, he handles things pleasantly; one may say, he did not want Eloquence, no, nor Elegance neither.

ETHERIUS.

Etherius. *Etherius*, Bishop of *Axume* in *Spain*, and *Beatus*, Abbot and Priest, were some of the first that opposed *Felix* and *Elipandus's* Error: These charged them with *Eutychianism*. It was to vindicate themselves, and to convince their Adversaries of the opposite Error, that they made 2 Books, in which they profess to hold the

Doctrine of the Council of *Ephesus*, and resist the Sentiment of their Adversaries, contrary to their Doctrine. These 2 Books are very much confuted, and full of several idle useless Reflections, and divers Repetitions. They were printed in *Canisius's* Antiquities, and in the last *Bibliotheca Patrum*.

PAULINUS of Aquileia.

Paulinus, &c. *PAULIN*, Bishop of *Aquileia*, was present at the Council of *Francfort*, held in 794. There he encountered *Felix* and *Elipandus's* Error, about the Title of adoptive Son, which they attributed to Jesus Christ; he made a small Writing and three Books upon this Subject. These Works are found among *Alcuin's*: They did formerly attribute to him the 7 Books of *Alcuin* against that Error. There is a Fragment yet extant of a Letter, directed to *Heistulphus*, who had killed his Wife, whom he suspected of Adultery; he does most sharply reprove that Lord, and lays a heavy Penance upon him. We may find also

some Fragments of *Paulinus* of *Aquileia*, in the first Tract of the *Miscellanea* of *M. Baluzius* [Tom. 1. p. 362.]

Lastly, the Book of wholesome Instructions, which went a long while under *St. Austine's* name, was restored to *Paulinus* of *Aquileia*, in the last Edition of this Father's Works, upon the Credit of an old Manuscript of *M. Colbert's* Library. It contains several useful Advices to lead a Christian Life, and is of the same Style with the Advertisement to *Heistulphus*. This Bishop died about the Year 803. His Style is very simple, and no way elevated.

THEODULPHUS Bishop of Orleans.

Theodulphus, &c. *Theodulphus*, Abbot of *St. Benedikt* upon the *Loire*, and afterward preferred to the Bishoprick of *Orleans*, before 794. flourished towards the end of this Century, and died towards 821. *F. Sirmondus* published this Bishop's *Opuscula* in 1646. [at *Paris*, with his own Notes.] The first and chief is his Capitulary, containing 46 Articles for the Instruction of the Priests of his Diocese. He discourses with them of the Dignity of their State, and recommends to them the Care of their Flock, Diligence in Reading, Praying and Working; he enjoins them, when they come to the Synod, after the Custom, to bring along with them the Habits, Books and Vessels, wherewith they perform their Functions, and 2 or 3 Clerks; to have a care, that the Bread, the Water and the Wine, wherewith they celebrate the Mass, be very decent and proper; to make the Bread themselves which is to be consecrated, or cause it to be made in their presence. He forbids Women to approach the Altar, whilst the Priest is celebrating; and orders, that their Oblations shall be received in their Seats. He forbids Priests to celebrate Mass by themselves, without other Communicants. He prohibits putting any thing

in Churches besides the Sacred Vestments, Vessels and Books. He will not have any body to be buried within the Church, but Clergymen only, or Persons of singular Piety. He prohibits Assemblies in the Church, for any other thing than Praying, and also Celebrating Mass without the Church. He extends the Prohibition of Churchmen keeping Women at home with them, to the nearest Relations. He forbids Clerks to go to the Tavern, and recommends to them Sobriety in the Feasts they are invited to. He forbids Presbyters to take the Tythes belonging to their Brethren, or to solicit and entice their Clerks. He charges all Presbyters to baptize Children in case of necessity, whether they be of their own Parish or not. He forbids Presbyters and Laymen to convert Sacred Vessels to prophane uses. He would have Schools set up in Parishes, to teach Youth to lead a Christian Life, of which he maketh an Abridgment; and all the Faithful to know the Lord's Prayer and the Creed. He exhorts them all to pray to God, at least, twice in the Day. He enjoins them to spend *Sundays* in Praying, and being present at the Divine Service, and prohibits all manner of Work but what is of necessity to dress Meat. He permits Travelling, provided they be present

Theodulphus. present at the Office. He charges the Laymen to be present at the first Vespers of Festivals, at Mattins, and at Mass; and would have them to be exhorted to the practice of Hospitality, to be deterred from false Oaths, Perjuries, false Witnesses; to be instructed in the Holy Scripture, to be reformed, to be admonished to be constant in Prayer. He exhorts Laymen to confess all their Sins, even those of Thought; and instructs the Presbyters how they ought to examine Sinners. He exhorts Men to the Works of Mercy, towards others. He will have the People to be put in Mind of the Obligation laid upon Children to honour their Parents, and upon Parents to use their Children gently, and of the mutual Love they owe one another; that Merchants and Men of Business are to be remembered, that they should not mind their temporal Gain so much as Life Eternal; that the People must confess their Sins the Week before Lent, and then receive Penance, in order to their doing of it, during Lent. He marks out several ways of obtaining forgiveness of Sins, he recommends the exact keeping of the Lent-Fast, and the joyning of Almsgiving to Fasting. He will not have Men to break their Fast in the ninth Hour of Prayer, but to stay till the Hour of Vespers. He thinks it would be a great perfection to abstain from Eggs, Cheese, Fish and Wine; yet he allows infirm Persons and Labourers to use them. He will have all the Faithful to communicate on Sundays in Lent, except those which are suspended the Communion; and that all take the Sacrament on Holy-Thursdays, on Easter-Eve and Easter-Day; that they abstain from the Use of Matrimony on Fast-days, and also some Days before the Communion; that they prepare themselves for this Holy Action by Almsgiving and good Works. That the Priests who say private Masses on Sunday, shall not say them publicly, lest they should take off the People from being present at the Mass in their Pa-

rishes. Lastly, he will have the People put in mind, that they should not eat, till they have been at the solemn Mass and the Sermon.

There was published since an Addition to this Capitulary, containing a general Advertisment about such things as the Parsons ought to instruct the People in.

This Bishop wrote one Book more upon Baptism, directed to Magnus Archbishop of Sens, wherein he explains the Ceremonies of that Sacrament; and a Tract of the Holy Ghost directed to Charlemagne, which is nothing else but a Collection of several Passages of the Fathers, to shew that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son; He cites the Books of the Trinity, and the Creed under Athanasius's Name.

Lastly, there are six Books of Theodulphus's Poems extant: The 1st. is a Piece directed to the Judges, to exhort them to do Justice. The 2^d. begins with a Catalogue, in Verse, of all the Books of the Old and New Testament; both of those which were in the Old Canon, and those that have been received since: It contains also Poems for Palm-Sunday, and several other Poems. The 3^d. contains an Elogy of Charlemagne, Pope Adrian's Epitaph, and Verses to several Persons. The 4th. Book contains Verses on the Fables, the Liberal Arts, Verses to Bishop Aulphus, and to Moduin, with some Verses of Moduin to Theodulphus. The 5th. contains Verses of Consolation upon his Brother's Death, a Description of the seven Mortal Sins, and an Exhortation to the Bishops; and the last, Verses upon different Points of Morality. F. Mabillon hath published [in his *Analecta*, Tom. I. p. 376.] * some more of them, which were not in F. Sirmondus's Edition. Theodulphus was a good Man, very zealous for the publick Good, and none of the least Writers, nor of the unlearnedest of his Time. His Poems are very fine, and surpass his Prose.

LEO III. Bishop of Rome.

Leo III. LEO III. was elected in the room of Adrian, January 28. 795. Presently after his Election, he sent Ambassadors to Charlemagne, to give him notice of it, and to carry him St. Peter's Keys and the City's Banner, and some other honourable Presents, praying him to send some of his Princes, to take the Oath of Allegiance of the Roman People. The King sent Angilbert, Abbot of the Monastery of St. Riquier, with some considerable Presents.

For all Leo had such a powerful Protector, yet he was assaulted (anno 799.) by a Faction of seditious People [headed by his Predecessor Adrian's Nephew] who fell upon him as he was going a solemn Procession, endeavoured to put out his Eyes and to cut out his Tongue, and dragg'd him into Prison in a Hall. It was found that he had not been maimed, as they thought. He fled into the French Ambassador's Lodgings, from whence he was conveyed to Spoleto, and thence he came to France, to King Charlemagne, who was then in Saxony. The King having heard his Complaints, sent him back again to Rome with the same Marks of Honour with which he had received him, and promised him, that he would soon come to do him Justice upon the Place: And, indeed, the next Year, having held his Parliament at Mentz, he went into Italy, both to take Cognizance of the Outrages done to the Pope, and to oppose the Designs of Grimaldus Duke of Beneventum. Being at Rome, he admitted Pope Leo to justify and clear himself by Oath, there appearing no body to accuse him: After this, he brought those that were guilty of the Assault made upon him to Trial; they were condemned to Death, but the Pope obtained their Pardon. Leo, to acknowledge and requite so many Favours, as the Holy See had received from Charlemagne and his Progenitors, moved it to the People, to desire him for their Emperor, and crowned him on Christmas-day, in St. Peter's Church (anno 800) taking the beginning of the Year from January, and (anno 801) taking it from Christmas, according to the Authors of this Time. After the Ceremony ended, the Pope did adore the new Emperor; that is, he kneeled before him, and took the Oaths of Allegiance to him, and set up his Picture in publick, to the end that all the Romans might pay him this Duty.

Anno 804. Leo came into France to visit Charlemagne, and was made welcome by that Prince, who sent his Son to meet him, and came himself to receive him at Rheims, from whence he led him to his Palace at Cressy, and thence to Aix-la-Chapelle. After his Return to Rome, he enjoyed the

Pontificate quietly till Charlemagne's Death: But (anno 815) there was another Conspiracy made against Leo, which he avenged so severely, that he put some of the Criminals to death with his own Hands. Lewis the Meek found fault with his Proceeding, as being disagreeable to his natural Lenity, and contrary to the Right of Sovereignty he had in Rome: He ordered Bernard King of Italy to go thither, and to enquire into the Truth; which he did. The Pope, on his part, sent Legates into France, to justify himself. But the Romans were so incensed against his Cruelty, that this Pope being sick, they seized on his Lands and plundered his Castles. He died May 23^d. 816.

There be 13 Letters of this Pope's extant among the Councils. [Tom. VII. p. 1111.]

The 1st. is an Answer to Kenwolve King of the Mercians, who had desired him to abolish the Archbishoprick of * Lichfield, and to restore the Bishop of Canterbury to the Rights taken away from him by Offa and Adrian I. The Pope granted him his Request, and having commended the King and Athelward Archbishop of Canterbury, he subjected to his Jurisdiction all the Churches that had been taken from him: We have this Letter only upon the Faith of William of Malmesbury. The 2^d. Letter of Leo is a Privilege of Exemption granted for a Chappel, built by Charlemagne, in Saxony, upon the Hill of Eresburgh. The 3^d. is directed to Charlemagne: He complains that this Emperor had been informed, that he could send him no Commissioners which he would admit to inform of his Affair; he tells him, that and made it is a Calumny, and prays him not to believe it. In the 4th. he informs Charlemagne of the Treaty concluded between the Saracens and the Inhabitants of Sicily. In the 5th. he tells him what had passed in a Meeting of some Moors by this and Greeks. In the 6th. he acquaints him with the Death of Pope was the Emperor Constantine, killed by Leo's Order. The 7th. despoiled and the 8th. are Letters of Thanks, directed to the same of Charlemagne. In the 9th. he solves some Questions upon the Scripture, propounded by Charlemagne. The 10th. is a supplicatory Letter, to pacify Charlemagne, who was incensed against him, and to persuade him of his Innocency. By the 11th. he asks him leave, to let a Bishop of the Isle of Grado, banish'd, stay in a Town of Italy. In the 12th. he complains, that Charles's Commissioners, who should have done him Justice, had done him Wrong. The 13th. is a Letter of Thanks to Riculphus, Bishop of Mentz. Leo's Letters are written with great Art, but with little Reference to Ecclesiastical Matters.

Some Greek Authors against the Iconoclasts.

Authors.

Here are some Authors, of whose Works we will speak more at large, when we treat of the Acts of the 7th. Council.
Tarasius, *Photius's* great Uncle, who from the Emperor's Secretary was made Patriarch of *Constantinople* (anno 785.) and died in 806. wrote a Circular Letter about Images; two Letters directed to Pope *Adrian*, and an Apologetic Oration upon his Election.

Epiphanius, Deacon of *Catana* in *Sicily*, recited a Panegyrick in the 7th. Council.
Basil of *Ancyra* offered a Confession of Faith to the same Synod.
Theodosius, Bishop [of *Ammorium*] made a Writing upon the same Subject.

Authors.

E L I A S Cretenfis.

Elias.

This Author made some Commentaries upon St. *Gregory Nazianzen's* Works, which are printed, in the second Volume of that Father's Works. He hath done the same also upon the Works of some

other Greek Fathers, which are found Manuscript in Libraries. He wrote Answers to *Dionysius* the Monk's [8] Questions, which are extant in Greek and Latin, in the fifth Book of the Greek and Roman Law [l. 5. p. 194.]

Elias.

George Syncellus and Theophanes.

George, &c.

George Syncellus from the Patriarch *Tarasius*, made a *Chronicon* [from the Creation of the World to the Reign of *Maximinus* and *Maximinianus*, anno 300.]

which hath been continued by *Theophanes* a Monk [to the Reign of *Leo Armericus*, anno 813. They are printed the one at *Paris*, 1652. and the other 1655.]

George, &c.



The COUN-

OF THE COUNCILS

That were held in the
Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth AGES.

OF THE CHURCH.

A Conference held in 601. in England, in Worcestershire, between
Augustine the Monk, and the British Bishops.



AUGUSTINE the Monk, had instructed the *English*, and converted their King *Ethelbert*; and having a mind to unite the *Britains* to the *Roman Church*, he invited their Bishops and Doctors to a Conference. When they were come to it, he exhorted

them to endeavour unanimously the establishment of Religion. These *Britains* did not keep *Easter* at the same day with other Churches, and had several practices differing from them. They stood in the defence of them stoutly; and *Augustine*, seeing he could not prevail with them to leave them, they say, he proposed to them, to bring a sick Man in, and on either side to pray for his Health, and to follow the Usages and Doctrines of those that should heal him. They brought in a blind Man, and the *Britains* having tried in vain to restore him to his Sight, they affirm, that *Augustine* restored him by his Prayers. This Miracle did shake the *Britains*: But they said, they could regulate nothing, without being acquainted with their Brethrens mind, and they required a Synod might be kept, which was granted to them. Seven *British* Bishops met there, and the ablest

Monks of their Monastery of *Bangor*. *Augustine* propounded three things to them: 1. To keep *Easter* the same day with the *Roman Church*. 2. To baptize according to the practice of the same Church. 3. To preach the Gospel to the *English*, promising them the toleration of their other Practices, if they would yield these three Points. They would not, and went away very much offended, for that he did not come to meet them, when they came to him. Upon that refusal, *Augustine* told them, that since they would not have Peace, they should have War; and that they should be slain by those to whom they would not preach Life. That was executed accordingly. The King of the *English* declared War against them, and defeated them in a bloody Fight, in which he put to the Sword above 1200 Monks of the Monastery of *Bangor*, who were come to the Army of the *Britains*, to pray for God's assistance upon them. This relation is taken out of the second Book of *Beda's Church-History*, Chap. 2. *Sigebert* marks the same Facts in his Chronicle; and some Historians do accuse *Augustine* the Monk of having had a hand in the Massacre of those poor *Britains*, who did not deserve such hard usage, by reason they maintained their ancient Customs, and the Liberties of their Churches, without deviating from the Catholic Faith.

The Assembly of Bishops held at † *Challon*, upon the River *Saone*, in 608. † [*Saballorum.*]

THIS Assembly deposed, unjustly, *Desiderius*, Bishop of *Vienna*, upon Queen *Brunchant's*

motion, and the earnest suit of *Aricius*, Archbishop of *Lyons*.

The Council of Toledo held under King *Gondemare*, in 610.

THIS Council was made up of Fifteen Bishops of the *Carthaginian Province*, who owned the Archbishop of *Toledo* for their Metropolitan, and promised subjection to him. King *Gondemare* caused this Constitution to be put in execution, and gave out a Declaration, which was subscribed by the Bishops of the other Provinces of *Spain*, wherein he decreed, that the Bishop of *Toledo* shall be acknowledged Primate or Metropolitan of the whole *Car-*

thaginian Province, and enjoyns all the Bishops of this Province to obey him. He observeth there, that the Country of *Carpetonia* is not a Province but part of the *Carthaginian Province*; and that as the other Provinces of his Kingdom, viz. *Lusitania*, *Bætica* and *Tarraconensis*, have each of them but one Primate, the *Carthaginian* likewise must have but one; according to the Canons and the ancient Usage.

The Council of Egara, under King *Sisebut*, held in the year 614.

THE Bishops of the Province of *Tarraco*, confirmed in this Council the Decree made in that of *Huesca*, concerning the Celebacy of the Clergy. The Town, where it was kept, was in the Province of *Tarraco*, but it is unknown, at present, under the name of *Egara*. *M. Baluzius* hath made a short Dissertation, in which he asserts, that *Egara* was in the place, where is now a little Town, named, *Terrasse* in *Catalonia*, within four or five

Leagues of *Barcelona*, in the Bishoprick whereof it is found. He proves it, 1. By the Situation of that Castle, which agreeth to that of *Egara*, which stood between *Barcelona* and *Girona*. 2. Because in the ancient Terriers or Maps, *Egara* and *Terracia* are spoken of, as standing in the same place. 3. Because in a Letter of *Raimondus* of *Barcelona*, of the year 1112. it is observed, that the Parish of *Terrasse* stands in the place, where the Church of *Egara* formerly stood.

The fifth Council of Paris.



PARIS. **T**HIS Council met in 615. called by *Clotharius* the second, then in Possession of the Kingdoms, which did belong to *Theodebert* and *Theodorick*; therefore it was made up of a great number of Bishops. It is observed in the end of the Canons of this Council, that they had been subscribed by 79 Bishops; but we have not their Names, neither is it certain, whether they were present in it. If this number of Bishops met there, it was the most numerous Council that ever was held in France. It made 15 Canons of great importance.

By the 1st. it is ordered, that the ancient Canons shall be kept; that for the future, a Bishop being dead, he that shall be chosen by the Metropolitan, who is to ordain him, by the Bishops of the Province, and by the Clergy and the People of the City, shall succeed him; and that Ordinations made either by Force, Faction or Bribery, or without the approbation of the Metropolitan, and the consent of the Clergy and the People, shall be declared null.

The 2^d. Canon forbids Bishops to chuse their Successors. It forbids also providing them Successors, unless they be altogether unable to govern their Church and Clergy.

The 3^d. imports, that if a Clerk, of what Quality soever he be, despising his Bishop, have Recourse unto Princes, great Lords, or to some other Protectors, no Body shall receive him before he obtains his Bishop's Pardon: and that if any Body keeps him, after Warning given him from the Bishop, he shall be punished according to the Ecclesiastical Laws.

The 4th. declares that no (a) Secular Judge shall

judge or condemn any Presbyter, Deacon or Clerk, nor any of those that belong to the Church, without acquainting the Bishop with it; and that if any Body attempts to do it, he shall be separated from the Church, till he amends and acknowledges his Fault.

Euseb. hist. ecc. l. 10. c. 7. Just. of Carthage from paying Taxes, Conf. No. lest it being impoverish'd there- vel. 79. c. 6. by, God's Worship should be in- 1. 8. in- terupted or hindred. And af- 144. far. & terward, about the Year 536.

125. c. 21. *Justinian* ordained, that in causes merely Civil, the Bishops *Conc. Aga-* should hear and determine of the Cases of the Monks and Nuns, *then. c. 32.* as also of all their Clergy, unless the Matters under decision *Rom. 13.* were too difficult for the Bishop in which case they were com- *1. Conc.* manded to go to the Civil Judges. These Imperial Grants *Chalc. c. 9.* did the Bishops (as Patrons of the Ecclesiastical Franchises) *Conc. Car.* confirm and establish by several Canons in this and several *3. c. 9.* other Councils; and that the Secular Judges might not dare *Conc. Tol.* to break in upon these Privileges, they back'd them with *3. c. 13.* *Anathema's* and Excommunications, and so might warrant- *Conc. Ma-* ably enough do, so long as the Laws of the Empire stood *tisc. c. 8.* in Force: But for the Clergy to stand upon such Exemptions as these, and claim them upon the Account of their Order, as the Clergy of the *Romish* Communion now do, is both contrary to Scripture and the Practice of the purer Times of Christianity: For before *Justinian's* Time the Bishop's ordinary Jurisdiction was but a Power of Enquiry and Restraint for violating and corrupting the Ecclesiastical Discipline.]

The 5th. puts the Franchisements of the Church under the Bishop's Protection, and forbids under the Pain of Excommunication,

to constrain any be-
[(b) Not constrain any Church-
men to serve the Publick.] It hath
been the Wisdom of all Ages
Euseb. hist. ecc. l. 10. c. 7. the Christian Church, to ex-
empt their Clergy from Publick and Civil Employments and
Offices, that they might with the greater Care and Diligence
attend the Service of God, which this Council endeavours to
preserve.]

The 6th. orders, that the Revenues given to maintain the Church Fabricks, shall be managed by the Bishops, Presbyters and other Clerks, serving those Churches according to the Intention of the Donor; and that, whosoever shall take away any part of them, he shall be cut off from the Church, till he hath made Restitution.

By the 7th. all sorts of Persons are forbidden to seize, either by an Order from the Prince, or by Authority from a Judge, or in any other manner whatsoever, on the Estate left by the Bishops, or other Clerks, whether they belong to the Church, or be their own. It is ordered, they shall be kept and preserved by the Arch-deacon and the Clergy: they are excommunicated that shall seize on them; and it is said, they are to be looked upon as Murderers of the Poor.

The 8th. forbids Arch-deacons, yea, and the Bishops themselves, to appropriate to themselves, after the Death of Abbots, Presbyters, and other Clerks, ministering in the Churches, the Moveables belonging to them, under pretence of taking them for the Bishop or the Church.

The 9th. forbids Bishops to challenge to themselves the Goods, Churches, or Clerks of other Bishops, although the Kingdom or Province had been divided; and those that shall do so, it deprives them of those charitable Duties which their Brethren use to pay them, till they have restored what they have taken, and made Restitution of the Fruits.

The 10th. renews the Constitution made in the second Council of *Lyons*, held in 570. whereby it was ordered, that the last Wills of Bishops, Presbyters and other Clerks, who bequeath Legacies to Churches, shall be executed, tho' their Testaments were not in due Form.

The 11th. Canon renews the Constitution, whereby a Bishop, being at Variance with another Bishop, is bound to apply himself to the Metropolitan; and he that applieth himself to a Secular Judge, is deprived of Communion with the Metropolitan, until he gives an account of his proceeding in the next Synod.

The 12th. separateth from the Communion, until the Point of Death, such Monks and Nuns as go out of the Monastery, which they had chosen for their Abode, if being warned of it, they refuse to return: but if they return to it, and make an humble Satisfaction, the Eucharist may be given them.

The 13th. Canon excommunicates the Virgins or Widows, who do marry, after having put off the Secular Habit, to lead a Religious Life at home.

The 14th. prohibits Marriage with the Brother's Widow, the Wife's Sister, the Daughters of two Sisters, the Uncle's Widow by the Father's and Mother's Side, and with a Maiden that hath taken a Religious Habit. It excommunicates those that contract such Marriages, till they separate themselves.

The 15th. imports, that the Jews are not to sue for the Costs of Recovery of Money from Christians; and if any of them should obtain them, he ought to be baptized, with all his Family.

To this Council is annexed *Clotharius's* Edict, containing the Confirmation of the foregoing Canons. Nevertheless, there be some of them, to which he hath subjoyned Modifications and particular Conditions. To the Canon concerning Bishops Ordinations, it adds that if the Person elected be found worthy of it, he shall be confirmed by Order from the Prince; and that a Court-Officer may be chosen, if he be a deserving and learned Man. To the Canon forbidding Bishops to go to Court, it adds, they may go thither, to obtain some Favour, and upon what account soever they shall go thither, if they return with the Prince's Letters, they are to be excused. As for the Inhibition of Clerks applying themselves to Secular Judges, it excepts from it Criminal Matters, into which Secular Judges are appointed to enquire, calling the Bishops to them. It excepts likewise Matters concerning the Publick, which the Bishop and the Secular Magistrate are appointed Judges of. It adds some other Ordinances about Civil Matters.



A Council held in France, about the same Time as the former, of which the Place is unknown.

THE same Manuscript, where this Council of Paris is found, contained the Canons of another Council, of which we know neither the Place nor the Year.

The 1st. orders the Execution of the Canons of the Council of Paris.

The 2^d. prohibits consecrating Altars in the Places where Corpses are buried.

The 3^d. orders, that Monks shall observe their Rule, and live in common, under the Government of an Abbot or a Superior.

The 4th. prohibits baptizing in Monasteries, celebrating Masses for Secular Persons deceased, and burying the Dead, without the Bishop's Leave.

The following Canons to the 8th. are wanting, the Manuscript being defective in that place.

The 8th. forbids Clerks to have Women in their Houses, excepting their Sister or Aunt.

The 9th. confirms the Right of Sanctuaries for Churches, and prohibits taking away by force those that fly into Churches.

The 10th. Canon is wanting.

The 11th. prohibits depriving Abbots or Archpriests of their Ecclesiastical Function, unless they be guilty of some Fault, that deserveth it, as also advancing them to those Dignities, with the Prospect of some Reward: It prohibits, moreover, making a Layman Archpriest.

The 12th. forbids Presbyters and Deacons to marry, upon pain of being turned out of the Church.

The 13th. prohibits entertaining those that are excommunicated by their Bishop; and that they may be known, it orders the Bishops, that excommunicated them, to acquaint the neighbouring Towns and Churches with it.

The 14th. decrees, That Freemen, having sold or engaged themselves, out of necessity, shall be restored again to their former state, giving back the Price they had taken for their Engagement.

The 15th. Canon is imperfect: The next are lost; nay, it is not known how many there were of them.

The second Council of Sevil.

THIS Council was held under King* Sisebut, in November 619. and made up of seven Bishops, of the Province of Bætica, the President whereof was Isidore Bishop of Sevil. Several Ecclesiastical Affairs were treated of there, which are related in the Acts of this Council.

In the 1st. Action was received the Petition presented by Theodulphus, Bishop of Malaga; wherein he complain'd, that his Diocese, having been spoiled by the Wars, was become a Prey to the neighbouring Bishops, who had invaded it. It is ordered, that all the Churches, formerly belonging to him, shall be restored to him, all Right of Prescription notwithstanding, because none such is to be alledged when Hostilities are the Ground of the Possession.

In the 2^d. Action they named Deputies to compose the Difference between the Bishop of Astigi and that of Corduba, about a Church which they both claimed to belong to their Jurisdiction, and to be within the Limits of their Diocese. The Council orders, that Deputies shall first of all examine the Limits of the Diocese, and then the Possession; and that if it be of thirty Years standing, the Prescription shall take place in the behalf of the Possessor.

The 3^d. Business debated in this Council, is concerning a Clerk of Italica, who having left his own Church, went to that of Corduba. They took from thence the Opportunity to renew the Canons, forbidding Clerks to leave their own Churches to go to others.

The 4th. Constitution is against the unlawful Ordinations, made at Astigi, where some Persons that had married Widows had been ordained Clerks, their Ordinations are declared null, and they are forbidden to be raised to the Order of Deacons.

In the 5th. place they depose a Presbyter and two Clerks, of the Church of Egabro, who had been irregularly ordained, the Bishop having fore Eyes, had only laid his Hands on them, whilst that a Presbyter did bless them. They declare they would have punished that Presbyter for his boldness, if he had been alive still.

The 6th. Deliberation is concerning a Presbyter of Corduba, unjustly condemned by his Bishop: He is restored again, and Bishops are generally forbidden to depose a Priest or a Deacon, unless their Cause was examined in a Council. They are excommunicated, *That condemn them without Examination, by a Tyrannical Power, and not by Canonical Authority; or that advance some out of Favour, and debase others out*

of Hatred or Envy, and condemn them upon light Suspicions. They add, That a Bishop alone may indeed confer the Dignity of a Presbyter or a Deacon, but he alone cannot take it away from them to whom he hath given it. This is an excellent Instruction for Bishops.

The 7th. Constitution is made about the Permission which Agapius, Bishop of Corduba, had given to some Presbyters, to set up Altars and consecrate Churches, in the Bishop's Absence. The Bishops say, they do not wonder that such a Bishop had granted such Licences, because he was ignorant of the Church-Discipline, having been raised all on a sudden to the Sacerdotal Dignity: But they prohibit that Practice for the future, declaring, that altho' Presbyters have several Functions common with the Bishops, there be some forbidden them by the Ecclesiastical Laws, such as the Consecration of Priests, Deacons and Virgins, the Erection of an Altar, the Blessing of the Unction: That they cannot consecrate an Altar or a Church, nor confer the Holy Ghost by the Imposition of Hands on the baptiz'd, nor on Heretick Converts, nor consecrate the Holy Chrism, nor anoint the Fore-head of the baptiz'd therewith, nor so much as reconcile a Penitent in a publick Mass, nor send Circular Letters: That all these things are forbidden to Presbyters, because they have not the supreme Degree of the Sacerdotal Dignity, which by the Authority of the Canons is appropriated to Bishops only. They add, that Presbyters are not permitted to enter into the Baptistry, nor to baptize before the Bishop, nor to reconcile Penitents without his Order, nor to consecrate the Body and Blood of Christ, to preach, to bless or salute the People, in the presence of the Bishop.

The 8th. Decision is against such a Man of a Church, as having been set at Liberty by his Bishop, became disobedient. It is ordered, he shall be deprived of his Liberty, by reason of his Disobedience.

The 9th. Constitution imports, that the Stewards of Churches ought not to be chosen out of the Laity, but the Clergy; and that the Bishops shall not manage Church Revenues without the assistance of the Steward.

The 10th. Constitution confirms the Monasteries founded in the Province of Bætica, and forbids Bishops, upon pain of Excommunication, to seize on their Possessions, and to spoil them.

The 11th. grants to the Monks the Management of the Estate, belonging to Monasteries of Religious Women, upon condition that they shall dwell severally;

severally; and shall have no familiarity with them, they shall not see them, they shall speak with the Superior only, and that in the Presence of Witnesses.

The 12th. Business was, the Conversion of a Bishop of Syria, of the Sect of the *Acephali*, who coming into the Council, and denying there were two Natures in Christ, and maintaining the Godhead was passible in him, was convinc'd of the Truth, and converted by the Arguments of the Bishops of this Assembly.

The Council of Rheims, under Sonnatius.

FLothar, relates, that *Sonnatus*, Bishop of *Rheims*, held a Council of about forty Bishops, which made several Constitutions, whereof he inserteth the Extract in his History.

By the 1st. it is order'd, that no Body shall appropriate to himself what the Church hath invest'd him in as Tenant or Trustee, how long soever his Possession be.

The 2^d. forbids the Cabals of Presbyters and Clerks against their Bishops.

The 3^d. confirms the Canons of the Council of *Paris*, held under *Clotharius*.

The 4th. orders, that the Pastors of Churches shall carefully seek out Hereticks, to convert them.

The 5th. prohibits rash Excommunications, and gives to the Provincial Council Authority to judge of the Validity of the Excommunication.

The 6th. forbids Secular Judges to impose upon Clerks publick Taxes, or to lay any Penalty upon them, without the Bishop's Consent. Bishops are enjoy'd to correct Clerks, and forbidden to admit into the Clergy, without the Prince's or the Judge's Leave, those that are entrusted with the Care of the Revenue of the King's Lands.

The 7th. threatens to excommunicate those that shall violently take from the Church the Criminals fled into it. It orders, that before they be delivered, they shall take an Oath from them, into whose Hands they are delivered; that they shall not put them to Death, nor maim them, nor rack them; and that none shall be suffered to go out, before he hath promised to do Penance for his Crime.

[(a) The 7th. threatens to excommunicate those that shall violently take from the Church the Criminals fled into it.] The Original of this Privilege, allowed by the Heathens, and afterward by the Christians, to their Temples or Churches, was certainly taken from the Divine Constitution, given to *Moses*, to erect six Cities of Refuge in the Jewish Nation, though not altogether conformable to its use; nor of so beneficial an use. For *Moses* made the Cities only a Refuge, and that for such Murderers alone as had killed their Neighbours unawares; but the Heathens made their Temples, and that for all manner of Wickednesses, for so *Ulysses* says of the *Asylum* erected by *Romulus* at *Rome*: *Asylum aperuit, quo quisque perfugerit ab omni noxa liberatus esset*: And so *Herodotus* speaks of *Hercules's Asylum* at *Athens*. These Refuge-Temples were afterward much increased among the Heathen, and at length, about the Year 300. came to be in use among the Christians; for they thought it a shame that the Temples of the Heathen Gods should enjoy so great a Privilege, as to be Refuges for the Oppressed, and the Christian Temples should be destitute of it: Whereupon they were made such by the Edict of *Theodosius* and *Valentinian*, and also by the Canons of the Councils. But although such Grants might be of very good Advantage among Christians, being kept within the Bounds of the first Institution, to be a Protection for the Innocent and Oppressed; yet as they have been, and still are, abused in the *Roman* and other Churches, being made a Refuge for Murderers, Rebels, and other enormous Criminals, they are grievous both to the Church and all Civil Societies, and have been complain'd of, as such, by many eminent Lights of the Church, in the several Ages of it.]

In the last definition of this Council, it is proved, that there are two Natures in Christ, united in one only Person.

These Constitutions are subscribed by *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil*, and by the Bishops of *Elvira*, *Astoria*, *Astigi*, *Italica*, *Tuca*, *Malaga* and *Corduba*. This last, who was charged with Ignorance in the Council, was not *Agapius* but *Honorius*, who probably did succeed him.

The 8th. is against them that contract incestuous Marriages: It does excommunicate them, if they do not separate themselves, and declareth that they are to be deprived of their Places and Estates, till they have separated themselves.

The 9th. declareth, that Men ought to have no Converse with one guilty of wilful Murder, unless he committed it in his own Defence, and does not grant him the *Patium*, that is to say, the Absolution, but only at the Point of Death.

The 10th. condemns those that keep to themselves the Goods given by their Parents to Churches or Monasteries.

The 11th. forbids Christians to sell Christian Slaves to the *Jews* or *Pagans*.

The 12th. forbids Clerks to go out of their own Dioceses, without Letters from their Bishop.

The 13th. forbids Bishops to sell or alienate Church-Lands.

The 14th. puts to Penance those that imitate the Superstitions of *Pagans*.

The 15th. forbids to receive the Accusations of Slaves, and does not permit an Accuser, who could not prove the first charge, to alledge any other.

The 16th. excommunicates those that shall seize on Church-Goods, after the Bishop's Death.

The 17th. is against those that would enslave free-born Persons.

The 18th. forbids Clerks to go to Law without their Bishop's Consent.

The 19th. forbids to put in Lay-men for Arch-priests in Parishes. It permits only to ordain him a Clerk, who is an Elder among the Laity.

The 20th. orders, that what shall be bestowed upon the Bishops by Strangers, shall belong to the Church, except those things given by a Bequest of Trust.

The 21st. excommunicates those that seize on Church-Lands.

The 22^d. deprives *ab Officio*, the Bishops who shall break the Holy Vessels, unless it be in extreme Necessity, and to redeem Captives.

The 23^d. prohibits ravishing of Widows or Virgins consecrated to God.

The 24th. excommunicates Judges, that shall despise the Canons, or violate the Prince's Edict, given at *Paris*.

The 25th. imports, that he that is ordain'd Bishop ought to be a Native, and chosen by the Votes of the People and the Bishops of the Province, and approved by the whole Council; that those that shall not be thus ordain'd, shall be turned out of their See; and the Bishops that have ordained them, shall be suspended *ab Officio*, for three years.

These are all the Canons of this Council, which was held about 630. There are 21. more attributed to this Council; but it is evident they are much posterior to it: They are not related by *Flodoard*.

The fourth Council of Toledo.

This Council was assembled in 633. by King *Sisenand*. The Archbishops of *Sevil*, *Narbon*, *Merida*, *Braga*, *Toledo* and *Tarragona* were present in it, together with 53. of their Suffragan Bishops, and 7. Presbyters, Bishop's Deputies. The Assembly was held in the Church of *Leocadia*.

The Council begins with a larger Confession of Faith than the ordinary Creeds, chiefly about the Incarnation. The Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is establish'd there.

Then the Bishops declare, that as they have but one Faith, so they judge it fit, that they should have but

Council IV. of Toledo. but one Discipline, and observe the same things in the Celebration of Divine Service.

The 3^d. Constitution is concerning Provincial Councils: It decrees, that seeing they cannot easily be assembled twice in the year, they shall hold one every year, the 16th. of May, in what Town the Metropolitan shall please to appoint; that all those that have any Matters against the Bishops or the Magistrates, and great Lords, shall bring them to that Tribunal, and what shall be adjudged by the Synod shall be executed by the King's Officer: that in case there be any Matter of Faith, or any Affair concerning the Good of the whole Church, they shall call a General Synod of the Provinces of *Spain* and *France*.

In the 4th. Canon they settle the Form or Order of keeping the Council. In the Morning, the Porters having turned the People out of the Church, must stand at the Door they are to come in at; that the Bishops are to enter in first, and then the Presbyters, and at last the Deacons they shall stand in need of: that the Bishops shall sit down in the Form of a Circle, and the Presbyters behind them: that the Deacons ought to stand up before the Bishops: that they shall also bring in some Notaries to read or to write. Then the Doors being shut, the Archdeacon shall say aloud, *Pray ye*: that one of the eldest Bishops shall pray aloud, the rest being prostrate: this Prayer being ended, the Archdeacon shall say, *Rise up*: then he shall read the Canons, ordering the holding of Provincial Councils; and the Metropolitan shall invite all them that have any Matter, to propound it: that they shall end that which is propounded before they begin another: that if any of them that are without hath any thing to propound, he shall acquaint the Metropolitan with it, who shall relate it to the Council; that he shall be brought in, freely to propose what he hath to say: that the Council shall not end till all Matters be dispatch'd, and that none of the Bishops shall go away, before it be finished.

The 5th. decrees, that the Metropolitans shall write to one another three Months before the *Epiphany*, to agree together about the Day on which *Easter* is to be kept; and then they shall acquaint the Bishops of of their Provinces with it, to avoid the Differences which happen'd in *Spain* about *Easter-day*, because of the several Tables.

The 6th. Canon contains a large Passage of St. Gregory, touching the Liberty of baptizing with one or three Immersions, according to the Use of the Place.

The 7th. Canon determines, that the Passion shall be preached on *Good-Friday*, and the People shall beg aloud the Pardon of their Sins, that the Faithful being purified by the Compunction of Repentance, may celebrate the *Resurrection-Sunday*, and receive the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ with a clean and pure Heart.

The 8th. prohibits breaking the Fast of *Good-Friday* before Sun-set, excepting only Children, Aged, and Sick Folks.

The 9th. orders, that on *Easter-eve* they shall bless the Lamp and the Taper. Some Churches of *France* did not observe this Practice, wherefore they are enjoyn'd to observe it for the future.

In the 10th. they are reprov'd, who never said the Lord's Prayer but on *Sunday*. They prove, by the Testimonies of St. Cyprian, St. Hilary, and St. Augustine, that this Prayer is to be said every Day; and judged this Practice so necessary, that they threaten to depose the Clerks, that shall omit saying that Prayer every Day in their publick or private Office. This shews, that Clerks did even then recite their Office in private.

The 11th. Canon prohibits singing *Hallelujah* during the whole *Lent*, because it is a time of Mourning, as well as the Kalends of *January*, in which they abstain from Flesh, as in *Lent*, to feed only on Fish and Herbs. It is observ'd, that some did likewise abstain from drinking Wine: In former time,

Abstinence from Wine was as strictly commanded as Abstinence from Flesh.

The 12th. Constitution decrees, that the *Laudes* shall not be said after the Epistle, but after the Gospel. These *Laudes* are some Verses which they recited before the Offertory.

The 13th. rejects the Opinion of those, who believed, that the Hymns of Humane Composition, made in the Praise of the Apostles and Martyrs, were not to be recited, as not being drawn out of the Canonical Scriptures, nor authorized by Tradition. They observe, that if it were not lawful to recite any thing in the Divine Service, but what is from the Scripture, they should retrench the most part of the Masses, Prayers, Collects, Recommendations, and most of the Prayers said in the Confirmation.

The 14th. orders, that the Song of the three Children in the Furnace shall be sung in the Pulpit, at the Mass, on *Sundays* and Holy Days.

The 15th. orders, that, in the End of the *Psalms*, they shall not only say, *Glory be to the Father*, but *Glory and Honour be to the Father*.

In the 16th. it is observed, that some do not say the *Gloria* after the Responses, because it agrees not with what was said. *Gloria* is to be said when the Subject is joyful and cheerful; and the beginning of the Response to be repeated when it is sad and mournful.

The 17th. Canon pronounces Excommunication against them that will not receive the *Revelation* of St. John, as a Divine Book, or that will not read it in their Churches, from *Easter* till *Whitsunday*, in the time of Divine Service.

The 18th. orders, that after the reciting of the Lord's Prayer, and the mingling of the Bread with the Wine in the Cup, they shall bless the People before the Distribution of the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. It says also, that Priests and Deacons ought to receive the Communion at the Altar, the rest of the Clergy in the Choir, and the People without the Choir.

The 19th. forbids advancing to the Priesthood the following Persons; them that have been convicted of any Crimes; or that having confessed them, have done Penance publickly.

Them that have been Hereticks, or baptiz'd in an Heresy, or rebaptiz'd.

Them that have made themselves Eunuchs, or have lost some of their Limbs.

Them that have had many Wives, or have married Widows, as also those that have had Concubines.

Those of a servile Condition.

Neophytes, Laymen; or those that are entangled in Businesses.

The Ignorant and Unlearned; those that are not yet 30 years old, and have not passed through the Ecclesiastical Degrees.

Them that seek to be ordained by Bribery, or to buy that Dignity.

Those that are chosen by their Predecessors.

Those that have not been chosen by the People and the Clergy; nor approved by the Metropolitan and the Provincial Synod.

That he that hath all these Qualifications, is to be consecrated on a *Sunday*, by all the Bishops of the Province, or at least by three Bishops, with the Consent of the others, in the presence and by the Authority of the Metropolitan, and in the place which he shall chuse.

The 20th. forbids making any Persons Deacons before 25. years of Age, and Presbyters before 30.

The 21st. recommends to Bishops a chaste and innocent Life, that they may offer the Sacrifice with Purity, and pray to God for others.

The 22^d. exhorts them, not only to keep a pure Conscience, but moreover, to have a care of their Reputation, and to have always in their Chambers some Persons of probity with them, which may bear Witness of it.

Council IV. of Toledo.

Council
IV. of
Toledo.

The 23^d. enjoyns the same thing to the Presbyters and Deacons, that do not live with the Bishop.

The 24th. commands, that young Clerks shall dwell all together in the same Hall, under the Conduct of an Elder.

The 25th. recommends to Bishops the Knowledge of the Holy Scripture and the Canons.

The 26th. shews, that the Presbyters, put into Parishes, ought to receive from the Bishop a Book, containing the Service of the Church, and instructing them in the manner of administering the Sacraments, and when they come to the Council or in his Visitation, they ought to give an account to the Bishop, how they celebrate Service and administer Baptism.

The 27th. that the Presbyters and Deacons put into Parishes, are to promise to their Bishop, that they will live regularly and orderly.

The 28th. that, if a Bishop, a Presbyter, or a Deacon, have been unjustly condemned, and their Innocency be acknowledged in a second Synod, they cannot be what they were before, till they have received before the Altar, and from the Bishop's hands, the Degrees which they were fallen from. If it be a Bishop, he shall receive the Stole, the Ring, and the Staff; If a Priest, the Stole, and the Chasuble; If a Deacon, the Stole, and the Albe; If a Subdeacon, the Chalice, and the Patine, or Cover of it; and so of the other Degrees, which shall receive again what was given them at their Ordination.

The 29th. is against the Clerks, who consult Diviners, or use Sorcery. It is ordered they shall be deposed, and shut up in Monasteries, to do Penance the rest of their Life.

The 30th. forbids Bishops bordering upon the Enemies of the State, to receive any order from Strangers.

The 31st. forbids Bishops to be Judges between Princes and their Subjects, who are accused of High-Treason, till they have promised to pardon the guilty.

The 32^d. warns the Bishops not to suffer the Magistrates and Men of Power to do unjustly, and oppress the Poor, to reprove them, if they perceive them to do so; and when they will not amend, to complain to the King.

The 33^d. forbids Bishops to take to themselves above the third part of the Revenues of Churches founded in their Diocess, tho' it leaves them the whole Administration thereof.

The 34th. appoints, that between the Bishops of the same Province, thirty years possession shall be a valid Title to keep the Churches, which they possess in the Diocess of another, but not between Bishops of different Provinces.

The 35th. puts in an Exception as to Churches newly built, and orders, that, altho' the old Church belongs to him who enjoy'd it, thirty years since, notwithstanding the Church newly built shall belong to the natural Bishop of the place where 'tis built.

The 36th. appoints the Bishop to visit every year the Churches of his Diocess; and if he cannot do it, to commit the doing of it to some Priests and Deacons of known probity.

The 37th. declares, that Men are bound to pay what they promised to give, for the performing some Ecclesiastical Service.

The 38th. imports, that seeing Presbyters are bound to assist the Poor, if it fall out, that they who have bequeathed something to some Church, be brought to Misery, they or their Children, that Church is bound to help them.

The 39th. forbids Deacons to take place of the Priests, and to place themselves in the highest place of the Choir, whilst the Presbyters stand below.

The 40th. forbids Deacons having two Stoles; yea, and having one of divers Colours, or embroidered with Gold.

The 41st. enjoins all Clerks to shave the whole Crown of their Heads, leaving but a small Tuft of

their Hair in the form of a round Circle, or a Crown.

The 42^d. and 43^d. forbid Clerks to dwell with Women, not related to them, and only permits them to live with their Mother, Sister, Daughter, and Aunt.

The 44th. appoints, that Clerks marrying Widows, divorced or debauched Women, shall be separated from them by their Bishop.

The 45th. that Clerks taking up Arms shall be put to Penance in a Monastery.

The 46th. that a Clerk found robbing Sepulchres, shall be expelled out of the Clergy, and put to Penance for three years.

The 47th. declares, that agreeably to King Sisenand's Order, the Council decrees, that Clerks shall be free from all publick Offices.

The 48th. orders, that all Bishops shall have Stewards to manage their Churches Revenue.

The 49th. imports, that a Monk may be made so by the Devotion of Parents, or his own Profession; that all they that are made Monks by either of these two ways, shall be obliged to continue Monks, and that they are not permitted to return to the World.

The 50th. gives Clerks leave to become Monks.

The 51st. forbids Bishops abusing Monks, but it preserveth them the Right which the Canons give them, to exhort Monks to a good Life, to instruct Abbots, and other Officers; and to correct what is done amiss, contrary to the Rule.

The 52^d. orders, that Monks leaving their Monastery, to return into the World, shall be reprov'd, and put to Penance.

The 53^d. prohibits that sort of religious Persons, which are neither Clerks, nor Monks; and enjoyns Bishops to put them to the choice of either of those professions.

The 54th. declares, that they, who being in danger of Death, undergo Penance without confessing any particular Sin, but saying only in general, *That they are Sinners*, may be prefer'd to the Ecclesiastical State; but it is not so with them who have confessed some grievous Crime.

The 55th. commands, that those that yielded to undergo Penance, and prepared themselves to do it, shall be obliged to finish it, and shall be constrained by the Bishop to it. But if they leave it, and refuse to take it again, they shall be condemned as Apostates, as also the Virgins or Widows which have put on the Religious Habit, if they return to the World and marry.

The 56th. distinguisheth two sorts of Widows, some Secular, who do not leave the Secular Habit, and others Religious which take a Religious Habit, and declares, it is not lawful for these to marry.

The 57th. forbids to constrain the *Jews* to turn, because Conversion ought to be wholly free; yet as for those who were forced to turn under King Sisenand, they will have them bound to continue Christians, because they have received Baptism, the Holy Chrism, and Christ's Body and Blood.

The 58th. pronounces Excommunication against those that shall favour, or uphold the *Jews* against Christians.

The 59th. orders, according to King Sisenand's advice, that those Christians that turned *Jews*, shall be constrained to return to the Church; and if they have circumcised their Children, they shall be separated from them.

The 60th. decrees, that the Children of the *Jews* shall be taken away from them by force, to be Christianly brought up in Monasteries.

The 61st. that the Children of the *Jews*, who are become Christians, shall not be deprived of their Fathers Estate, who are condemned for Apostasy.

The 62^d. enjoyns Christians to avoid Commerce with the *Jews*.

The 63^d. orders, that Christian Women married with *Jews*, shall be separated from their Husbands, if they will not be converted.

The

Council
IV. of
Toledo.

Council IV. of Toledo. The 64th. that the Testimonies of Christians, that turned Jews, shall not be received.

The 65th. forbids the Jews bearing publick Offices.

The 66th. forbids them having Christian Slaves.

The 67th. forbids the Bishops, who give nothing to the Church, to set at liberty the Slaves of their Churches.

The following Canons to the 75th. contain some other Constitutions concerning the Slaves and the Free-Men, which are now out of date.

The 75th. and last Canon, is concerning the Fealty due to Kings, and the security of their Persons. The Bishops detest there the Crime of those that violate the Faith they owe to their Prince, and make a long discourse to create an abhorrence of it. And to prevent any such thing in Spain, they pronounce a solemn *Anathema* against all those that shall con-

spire against Kings, that shall attempt against their Life, or usurp their Authority, after having repeated that *Anathema* thrice, with terrible Execrations, they promise Loyalty and Fidelity to King *Sisenand*, and his Successors, and at the same time they beseech him to govern his People with Justice and Piety, not to judge alone in Criminal Causes, but to cause them to be examined and judged by the ordinary Judges, reserving to him the Right of Pardoning. They pronounce *Anathema* against the Kings that should abuse their Authority to do Evil, and exercise a Tyrannical Power. And they do particularly declare, that by the consent of the whole Nation, King ** Suintila*, who deprived himself of the Kingdom, and laid down his Authority, by confessing his Crimes, is fallen from his Dignity, his Honour, and his Lands, as well as his Wife, his Children, and his Brother.

Council IV. of Toledo.

** Suintila the 2d.*

The fifth Council of Toledo, held in 636.

Of Toledo. **T**HIS Council was held in the same place with the former, but it was composed but of twenty two, or twenty three Bishops of several Provinces of Spain.

The first Canon decrees, that Litanies, that is to say, Publick Prayers, shall be made Yearly during the space of three Days, which shall begin the next Day after the 13th. of December, yet so, that in case one of the three Days should happen to be a Sunday, they shall be put off to the next Week.

The 2d. Canon confirms all that was done in the Council held under *Sisenand*, and decrees, that they shall be subject to King ** Cinthila*, his Successor.

** Suintila the 2d.*

The 3d. pronounceth *Anathema* against those that shall endeavour to usurp the Crown against the consent of the whole Nation, and without being chosen by the Nobility.

The 4th. forbids consulting Diviners about the Death of the Prince.

The 5th. prohibits speaking ill of him.

The 6th. decrees, that the favours of Princes shall continue and be enjoyed after their Death.

The 7th. That in all Councils shall be read the Constitution made in the 4th. Council for the safety of Kings.

The 8th. confirms the Princes power to grant Favours.

The 9th. contains a Thanksgiving to King *Cinthila*, and some Prayers and Vows in his behalf.

This Council is backed with King *Cinthila's* Declaration, confirming the Decree of the Council about the publick Prayers of December, accompanied with Fastings, and ordering, that, during that time, there shall be a cessation from Work and Business.

Of Toledo.

The sixth Council of Toledo, held in 638.

Of Toledo. **T**HIS is a National Council composed of above Sixty Prelates of *Cinthila's* Kingdom. They begin with a Confession of Faith pretty long, which is contained in the first Canon.

The 2d. confirms the use of the Litanies, or Publick Prayers, appointed in the preceding Council.

In the 3d. they give the King thanks for driving the Jews out of his Kingdom, and for suffering none but Catholics in it. They order, that the succeeding Kings shall hereafter be bound to take Oath, That they shall Tolerate no Infidels, and pronounceth *Anathema* against those that shall break that Oath.

The 4th. declareth, that Persons guilty of Simony are unworthy of being advanced to Holy Orders, and those that shall be found in Orders, to be fallen from their Degree, as well as those that have ordained them.

The 5th. decrees that those that shall receive any thing of the Church Revenue, shall hold it but by a precarious Title, and shall subscribe an Instrument testifying the same, that they may not plead Prescription.

The 6th. is against Men, Maidens, and Widows, leaving the Religious Habit, to lead a Secular Life; they are ordered to be shut up in Monasteries.

In the 7th. the same thing is ordered against those who submitted themselves to publick Penance.

The 8th. explains a Constitution of St. Gregory, whereby they suppose he gave leave to a Young Man, who underwent Penance upon fear of Death, to cohabit with his Wife, till he was come to an Age in

which it were easy to live Chastly. They say, that if he, or she, who hath not received Penance, dieth before he, or she, which submitted to Penance, have practised Continence, it shall not be lawful for the survivor to marry; but if he, or she, that was not put to Penance survive, he may marry again.

The 9th. ordains, that such as are made Free by the Church, shall at the Death of every Bishop renew the Declaration, that they depend on the Church.

The 10th. that these Free-Men shall do Service to the Church.

The 11th. forbids receiving Accusations, before Examination had, whether the Accusers be Persons to be allowed of as such.

The 12th, 13th, and 14th. are against Rebellious Subjects, and in the behalf of the good Loyal Servants of the Prince.

The 15th. maintains the Donations of Princes to Churches.

The 16th. provides for the Security of the Life and Estate of Kings Children.

The 17th. provides for the Safety of the Prince himself, and forbids all attempts against his Person and Crown, as long as he lives; and orders, that after his Death none shall invade the Kingdom by Tyranny, and none but a Noble Goth, and worthy of that Dignity, shall be advanced to the Sovereignty.

The 18th. Canon does yet renew the Inhibition of attempting against the Person of the Prince.

The 19th. is but a Conclusion of the Council.

Of Toledo.

The seventh Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. **T**HIS Council was held in 646, under King ** Chisdavind*, and composed of twenty five Bishops.

** Vidisundus.*

The 1st. Constitution is against Perfidious and Disloyal Clerks.

By the 2d. A Bishop, or a Presbyter, is permitted to finish the Celebration of a Mass begun, if he that is Officiating falls ill, and is not able to hold out to the end; but it forbids Presbyters, upon pain of Ex-

Of Toledo.

Council VII. of Toledo. communication, to leave the Holy Mysteries imperfect, or to celebrate after having taken the least Food.

The 3^d. renews the Canon of the Council of *Vatizans*, about the Bishops Funerals.

The 4th. is against the greediness of some Bishops of *Gallitia*, oppressing the Parsons of their Dioceses. They are forbidden by that Canon to take above two Pence *per Annum* of each Church in their Dioceses; to bring along with them in their Visitations more than five Persons, and to stay above a Day in any Church.

Council VII. of Toledo. The 5th. Canon appoints, that Hermits; or Recluses, that are ignorant, or whose Life is not virtuous enough, shall be shut up in Monasteries; that those only shall be let alone, who are commendable for their Holiness, and that for the future, none shall be admitted to that Profession, but such as have learned the Religious Life in Monasteries.

The last Canon imports, that the next Neighbouring Suffragans of the Arch-Bishop of *Toledo* shall come every Month into that Town, except in Vacation, and Vintage-times.

The Council of Lateran against the Monothelites under Martin I.

Of Lateran. **T**HE Mystery of Christ's Incarnation, which since *Nestorius's* Quarrel, had always afforded matter of dispute between the Bishops, produced a new one in this 7th. Century, which for a time divided the Eastern and Western Churches. The business was no more about the Question of the two Natures and one Person in Christ, the Authority of the Councils of *Ephesus* and *Chalcedon*, which had decided those two Points, was received by all the Patriarchs; and they that would not agree upon those Truths, were look'd upon as Hereticks, both in the East and the West. But about the Year 620, they stirred up another Question, whether they should say, that there were two Operations, and two Wills in Christ, as two Natures are said to be in him. *Theodorus* Bishop of * *Pharan* was the first, who expressing himself upon that Question, maintained, that the Manhood in Christ was so united to the *Word*, that, tho' it had its Faculties, it did not act by it self, but the whole Act was to be ascribed to the *Word*, which gave it the motion. *Cyrus* Bishop of *Phasis*, embraced that Opinion, and expressed himself about it in the same manner, denying there were two Operations in Christ, and affirming, that they were reduced to one principal Operation. Not that they denied, that Humane Actions and Passions were in Christ; but they affirmed, that they were to be attributed to the *Word*, as to the principal Mover, whose Instrument only the Man was. As for instance, they confessed, it was the Manhood of Christ that suffered Hunger, and Thirst, and Pain; but they asserted, that Hunger, Thirst, and Pain, were to be ascribed to the Person of the *Word*. In a word, that the *Word* was the Author and Mover of all the Operations and Wills of Christ. *Sergius*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, was of the same mind; and the Emperor *Heraclius* embraced that Party so much the more willingly, because he believed it to be a means to bring the *Jacobites*, *Severians*, and *Acephali*, back again to the Unity of the Church, by yielding to them part of what they contended for, and to oppose them more easily, by overthrowing the Foundation of one of their strongest Objections. And indeed, having had a Conference in the Year 622 with a *Severian* Bishop of *Armenia*, named *Paul*, he maintained against him, that there were two Natures in Christ: but he confessed, that they should acknowledge but one Operation only in him; and the better to confirm that Question, he made a Declaration, directed to *Arcadius* Arch-Bishop of *Cyprus*, against this *Paul*, and the rest of the *Acephali*, whereby he did forbid them to say, that there were two Operations, or two Wills in Christ.

In another Conference, which *Heraclius* had with *Athanasius*, the Universal Patriarch of the *Jacobites* in 629. He promised him to make him Patriarch of *Antioch*, if he would receive the Synod of *Chalcedon*, and own two Natures in Christ. But he asked the Emperor, whether they should say, that the Operations of Christ were double, or simple. Hereupon *Heraclius* consulted *Sergius* of *Constantinople*, and *Cyrus*, who did both agree, that they should own in Christ but one only *Deivirile* Operation.

Of Lateran. *Cyrus* having thus declared himself Head of a Party, was soon transferred from his small Bishoprick to the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*. Being raised up to that See, he reunited the *Theodosians*, or *Jacobites*, by Publishing some Articles, among which there was one that asserted one only Operation *Theandrick* or *Deivirile*, in Christ's Person; that Reunion being made in June, 633. *Cyrus* acquainted *Sergius* with it. *Sophronius*, who was afterwards Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, opposed it stoutly, and going away from *Alexandria*, came to *Constantinople* to expostulate the matter with *Sergius*, whom he found in the same Opinion with *Cyrus*. But this latter feigning himself to be a Peace-maker, writ to *Cyrus* to forbear saying, there was one or two Wills in Jesus Christ, and enjoined the same thing to *Sophronius*, seeking thus to extinguish that dispute. *Sophronius* requested a Writing from *Sergius* upon that Subject, and *Sergius* gave him a Letter, a copy whereof he sent to *Honorius* Bishop of *Rome*, together with the Letter he writ to him about that Question, in which he related to him that dispute, let him down the state of the Question, let him know how he did think fit to proceed in it, to stifle it in its Cradle, and desired him to write to him what he thought of it.

Honorius answered him, that he did approve of the Caution he used in it, and the suppressing of the terms of one or of two Operations, declaring he did own two Natures in Christ, and yet that he confessed but one Will in him.

In the mean while, *Sophronius*, being advanced to the See of *Jerusalem*, notwithstanding the content of the other Patriarchs, wrote a long Synodical Letter to *Sergius*, to maintain the Doctrine of the two Wills, and before he died he sent *Stephen*, Bishop of *Dora*, to *Rome*, vigorously to defend this Opinion, and to get the contrary Opinion condemned.

After *Honorius's* Death, *Heraclius* the Emperor published a Declaration intituled, *Ecthesis*, or *An Exposition of the Faith*, in which he enjoined silence about that Question. *Sergius*, the true Author of that Exposition, approved it, and died soon after in 639, leaving *Pyrrhus* for his Successor, who was of the same Opinion.

It was not so with *Honorius's* Successors. *Severian*, who sat but a little while upon the *Roman* See, refused to approve the *Ecthesis*, and *John IV.* did plainly condemn it. At last *Heraclius* died in March 641. His Son *Constantine* lived but four Months, and *Constantians* succeeded him the same year. Then *Pyrrhus* was expelled, as we have said, out of *Constantinople*, and *Paul* put in his place, who was not less zealous for the Party of the *Monothelites* than *Pyrrhus*. Pope *Theodorus* endeavoured to re-establish him, because he had feigned that his Mind was altered, and demanded that the *Ecthesis* should be abolished: but *Constantians* set out a Declaration [which he called *The Type*] like that of *Heraclius*, whereby he did command silence about the Question of the two Operations and the two Wills in Christ. This was published at *Constantinople* in 648. and in the beginning of the next year Pope *Theodorus* died.

Martin

Council of Lateran. Martin I. of that Name succeeded him, and was ordained in July: He called a Council at Rome presently, about the Question of the two Operations and the two Wills. It was held in Constantine's Church: 105 Bishops of Italy were present at it, among whom were Maximus, Patriarch of Aquileia, Deusdedit, Bishop of Calaris, and a Bishop and a Presbyter, Deputies of the Archbishop of Ravenna.

It was finished in five Actions, Sessions or Conferences.

Ab. i. The 1st. was held October 5th. 649. Theophylact, the first of the Notaries, having desired Pope Martin, to tell the Assembly the occasion of his calling this Synod, and what the matter was, he said, it was to oppose the Novelties and Errors published by Cyrus, Bishop of Alexandria, and Sergius Bishop of Constantinople, and defended by Pyrrhus and Paul, Successors of Sergius: that eighteen Years ago, Cyrus had published nine Articles in Alexandria, pronouncing Anathema against those that should not hold them, wherein he asserted one Operation only in Christ, as well of his Godhead as of his Manhood; that Sergius had approved this Doctrine in a Letter to Cyrus, and had confirmed it since, by making, under the Emperor Heraclius's name, an Heretical Exposition of Faith. He adds, that it follows from this Doctrine, that there is but one Will and one Nature in Jesus Christ, because the Holy Fathers have acknowledged, that when there was but one Operation, there was also but one Nature. Hereupon he cites the Testimonies of St. Basil, St. Cyril and St. Leo, proving that the two Natures in Jesus Christ have each of them their several Operations. He charges Sergius with having opposed this Doctrine, by setting out Heraclius's Exposition of the Faith, and confirming it by his approbation, and that of other Bishops. As for Pyrrhus and Paul, he says, they have made things worse; the first, by obtruding that Exposition of Faith upon many, whom he drew into his Opinion by Fear or Kindness; that he had indeed renounced that Error, and presented a Retraction to the Holy See; but he soon relapsed into his Heresie. In fine, that Paul had not only maintained this Error in a Letter written to the Holy See, but had also opposed the sound Doctrine by writing; and that, after Sergius's Example, he had moved the Emperor to make a new Exposition of Faith, called the Type, which did overthrow the Doctrine of all the Fathers, by forbidding to profess one or two Wills in Jesus Christ; that he had even ventured to take away the Altar consecrated in the Church of St. Placidia, and hindered the Apocrypharii of the Roman Church to offer thereon, or to receive the Sacraments; that he had persecuted them and several Bishops, Defenders of the Orthodox Faith, causing some to be banished, others imprisoned, and some abused; that Complaints of these things having been made at several times to the Holy See, and to his Predecessors, they used Letters, Advertisements, Threatnings, and Protestations, to repress those Novelties, and re-establish the sound Doctrine; but all these means having proved in vain, he did think it necessary to call them together, to the end, that having produced and examined the Writings of those Hereticks, and heard the Charges brought against them, they might pass their Judgment for the confirmation of the Faith, and rejecting of Error. Maurus, Bishop of Cesena, and Deusdedit, Deacon of Ravenna, told them, in the Archbishop of Ravenna's name, that having heard the same things from his Apocrypharii, he designed to come to the Council; but being hindered from coming, he had sent them, as his Representatives, and had given them a Letter, which they required to have read, and inserted in the Acts. It is directed to

[(a) Universal Bishop.] This Title, which is here given to Martin, Bishop of Rome, doth not import, as is pretended by the Church of Rome, the absolute Supremacy of that Bishop

Martin, to whom he gives the Title of (a) Universal Bishop: After having excused himself for not coming in Person to the

Council, he declareth that he rejects the Exposition of Faith, defended by Pyrrhus, and all that was done in confirmation of it; and professeth to believe two Operations and two Wills in Jesus Christ.

and John their Patriarchs; OEcumenico Patriarcha, Joanni. To the Universal Patriarch John. To the Universal Patriarch John. So Nicephorus calls the Patriarch of Alexandria, Judex Universi Orbis; the Judge of the whole World. And the Emperor Justinian writing to Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, thus supercribes, Epiphanius OEcumenico Patriarcha; to Epiphanius the Universal Patriarch. Nor doth the Bishop of Rome himself look upon it so much his own peculiar Title, but that he thinks it due to Therasius, Bishop of Constantinople, writing thus to him: Therasio Generali Patriarchæ Adrianus servus servorum Dei; to Therasius the general Patriarch, Adrian the meanest of God's Servants. So evident is it, that this great Title of Universal Bishop imports no such Pre-eminence as is pretended, and tho' the Title was commonly used, yet it was thought an Antichristian Usurpation in John Bishop of Constantinople, to assume such a Power and Prerogative to himself.]

over the whole Church, but only the large extent of his Jurisdiction above all other Bishops, as a great Patriarch. For we find the like Titles given to the other Patriarchs, not only by private Persons and Councils, but even by the Bishops of Rome themselves. For thus the 5th. Council of Constantinople salutes Menas, and John their Patriarchs; OEcumenico Patriarcha, Joanni. To the Universal Patriarch John. So Nicephorus calls the Patriarch of Alexandria, Judex Universi Orbis; the Judge of the whole World. And the Emperor Justinian writing to Epiphanius, Patriarch of Constantinople, thus supercribes, Epiphanius OEcumenico Patriarcha; to Epiphanius the Universal Patriarch. Nor doth the Bishop of Rome himself look upon it so much his own peculiar Title, but that he thinks it due to Therasius, Bishop of Constantinople, writing thus to him: Therasio Generali Patriarchæ Adrianus servus servorum Dei; to Therasius the general Patriarch, Adrian the meanest of God's Servants. So evident is it, that this great Title of Universal Bishop imports no such Pre-eminence as is pretended, and tho' the Title was commonly used, yet it was thought an Antichristian Usurpation in John Bishop of Constantinople, to assume such a Power and Prerogative to himself.]

Cont. Constantinop. 5. Act 1. Niceph. 1. 14. c. 34. Authen. Const. 3. Conc. Nicen. Act. 2. Greg. Mag. 1. 4. Ep. 34.

Maximus, Bishop of Aquileia, said, he was also of the same Mind, and believed two Operations in Christ. Deusdedit, Bishop of Calaris, requested that this Matter might be searched to the bottom, and all the Bishops were of that Mind.

This Examination was begun in the second Action, which is of the 8th of October. Stephen, Bishop of Dora, of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem, presented a Petition, in which he sets forth That Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, have published a new Heresie, teaching, That there was but one Operation and one Will in Christ, both of the Godhead and Manhood; that Sophronius, of Blessed Memory, Patriarch of Jerusalem, opoted that Error vigorously, and had made a Writing, in which he alledged an infinite number of the Holy Fathers Testimonies, to convince them of impiety, and to establish the Truth; That before he died he had made him to promise him upon the Calvary, that he would go to Rome, to solicit the Condemnation of this Error; that he had performed his Promise, notwithstanding all their endeavours to hinder him from it; that he had already demanded it of Theodorus, and did renew his request to the Council. *Ab. ii.*

Some Greek Presbyters and Monks, who had been a while at Rome, presented also a Petition against Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul, against the Ecthesis, the Type and the Doctrine of one Operation only, and desired the Council, carefully to examine that Question, and to determine it according to the Doctrine of the Church. Then Sergius's Letter to Theodorus was read, written in 643. wherein this Patriarch, having extolled the Authority of the Holy See, declares, that he follows Pope St. Leo's Doctrine, who taught, that the two Natures do operate in Jesus Christ, but in conjunction one with another; that he does anathematize and condemn all those, that do not hold this Doctrine. The rest of this Action was spent in reading 4 Synodical Letters sent by the African Bishops, against the Monothelites Exposition of Faith, one whereof is directed to Pope Theodorus, the other to the Emperor, the 3d. to Paul of Constantinople. They alledge, in this last, the Testimonies of St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, to prove the two Wills. The last Letter is Victor's, Bishop of Carthage, to Theodorus, upon the same Subject.

In the 3d. Action of the 16th. of October, they produced the Extracts of the Works of those who were accused of Error. They begin with those of Theodorus, Bishop of Pharan, who owns many sorts of Operations in Christ, but affirms, they all proceed from the Word, which gives motion to the Body, Soul, and the other Faculties of the humane Nature, as an Instrument which he maketh use of. Martin the First confutes his Opinion, to which he opposes some Testimonies of St. Cyril, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Basil, and the Council of Chalcedon. Cyrus succeeds Theodorus. They read his 7th. Article, where-

in he owns two Natures in Jesus Christ, but united in one Christ, who doth that which is Divine, and that which is Humane by one *Theandrick* or *Deivirile*. Action, according to * *St. Denys*. They join to this Article, *Sergius* his Letter to *Cyrus*, wherein he approves this Doctrine, and congratulates with him, for the re-union of the *Theodosians* with him. Upon occasion of *St. Denys*'s citation, they consulted the original, and they found that *Cyrus* and *Sergius* had changed the Terms of * *New Will* Theandrick, into that of *One Will* Theandrick. They compared their Expression with *Themistius*'s, and they proved, by some Passages of that Heretick, that *Severus* and he were the first that said, there was but one *Deivirile* Operation in Jesus Christ. They explain the meaning of the *Deivirile* Operation, and they say, 'tis nothing else but two sorts of Operations of the same Person, which yet proceed from two different Natures (*viz.* God and Man.)

This being examined, they read the Emperor *Heraclius*'s Exposition of the Faith, known by the Name of *Ecthesis*, in which he forbids this Expression, that there is one or two Operations in Christ, and commands them to say, that 'tis the same Son that operates in Christ the Divine and Humane Operations; that altho' some of the Fathers have said, there is but one Operation, it is better to forbear that Expression, lest it be thought, that they would deny the Existence of the two Natures; and that it must not be said neither, that there are two Operations in Christ, because this Expression, being not used by the Fathers, does offend many, who think, they admit two contrary Wills in Christ. To this *Ecthesis* they add the Acts of Approbation given by *Paul* and *Pyrrhus*, and the Letter of *Cyrus* of *Alexandria* to *Sergius*, wherein he commends the Emperor for making that Exposition of Faith.

Act. iv. In the 4th. Action, held the 19th. of October, *Martin* gave a short Account of what *Cyrus*, *Sergius* and *Paul*, had done against the Doctrine of the Church; and that he might fully convince *Paul*, their Successor, of the same Impiety, he caused his Letter to Pope *Theodorus* to be read, wherein, delivering his Opinion, he says, that he owns one Will in Jesus Christ, only to take away the contrariety of Wills, but does not intend to confound the two Natures: That Christ's Soul, endowed with its Intellect and Faculties, is led and moved by the Will of the *Word*, which causes it to act and to will as he pleases. He adds, that *St. Cyril* did deliver this Doctrine, and that *Sergius* and *Honorius* did newly teach it; that he stands to their decision, and is wholly of their Mind. Then was read the Emperor's Type, forbidding to speak or dispute about the Question of one or two Operations, or of two Wills, that he might secure the Peace of the Church. The Council commends the Emperor's intention, but disproves part of his Edict.

After they had read over all the Monuments they intended to condemn, they caused the Creeds of the Councils of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, and the definitions of Faith of the Councils of *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, and of the 5th. Council, to be recited.

In the 5th. Action, held the last day of October, they read the Testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers, proving either directly or by consequence, that there are in Christ two Wills and two Operations; and, on the other side, they produced some passages of several Hereticks, who had taught but one Will in Christ.

After that, *Maximus* of *Aquileia*, *Deusdedit* of *Calais*, and *Martin* deliver'd their Judgments, alledging many Reasons against the Opinion of the *Monothelites*; the whole Council approved it, acknowledging two Operations and two Wills, and made 20 Articles against the Error of the *Monothelites*, in the 18th. whereof it does anathematize *Theodorus*, *Cyrus*, *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul*, and all them that are or shall be of their Opinion.

Pope *Martin* published these Decrees by a Circular Letter, directed to all the Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, Abbots, Monks, and to the whole Church; and wrote of it particularly to several Bishops as it may be seen in the Extract of his Letters.

This Council of *Rome* provoked *Constans* against Pope *Martin*, because this Emperor look'd upon this Attempt, and the condemnation of his Type, as a kind of Rebellion, and an encroachment upon his Authority. He caused this Pope to be violently carried away from *Rome* in 653; and after most cruel usage, banished him to *Chersona*. After his departure, the *Romans* chose *Eugenius* in his room, in September 653. who did not openly consent to the Error of the *Monothelites*: But his *Apocrisarii* were forced to unite themselves with the *Monothelites*, who altering their Carriage and Expressions, said, that there was in Christ one and two Wills. At first they did say, that there was in Christ but one Operation and one Will; afterwards they would not have Men to speak of one or two Operations, and approved one only Will. The Type imposed silence about that Question, both as to the Operations and to the Wills. At last to comply with all, they would have it free for Men to say, that there was in Christ one and two Wills. *Peter*, who was chosen Patriarch of *Constantinople* in *Pyrrhus*'s room, who got up again to that See after *Paul*'s death, was of this Judgment, and many followed that Opinion. But, altho' these were different Expressions, yet they came up to the same thing; and did all tend to the same end, which was to tolerate the Doctrine of one Operation and one Will, and to make it run equal with that of the two Operations and the two Wills, so that every one might follow that which he liked best.

Yet all this condescension did not procure the re-union of the Eastern and Western Churches; for from Pope *Theodosius*'s time they continued divided, and the Popes sent no more Letters of Communion to the Patriarchs of the East, nor the Patriarchs of the East to the Pope. It was to take away this kind of Schism that the Emperor *Constantinus Pogonatus* appointed the third Council of *Constantinople*, which is reckoned the 6th. General, of which we are going to write the History.

The third Council of Constantinople, 6th. General.

Of Constantinople. *Constantinus Pogonatus* appointed this Council, for the re-uniting of the Churches of the East and the West, and the final determination of the Question of the two Operations, and the two Wills in Christ. He wrote to the Pope a Letter, dated the 12th. of August 678. directed to *Donus*, whom he supposed still living, and it was delivered to his Successor *Agatho*. This Pope having received the Emperor's Letter, held a Council at *Rome*, of 125. Bishops of the West, which determined the Doctrine of the two Wills, and confirmed what was done under *Martin*. There were at this Council, besides the Bishops of *Italy*, some Deputies of the

Churches of *France* and *England*. After the holding of this Council, the Deputies of the Holy See, and the Council departed, to go to *Constantinople*, to carry their Decision. After they were come, the Emperor gave order to the Patriarchs, to come to the Council, and also to bring the Bishops of their Patriarchate thither. It begun the 13th. year of the Empire of *Constantine*, in the year 680. Indiction 9th. in November, and was ended after eighteen Meetings or Sessions, the 16th. of September of the next year, Indiction 10th. The Emperor had the first Place there, and was present at the eleven first Sessions, and at the last: He was accompanied by the Consuls and Officers.

Council III. of Constantinople. Officers. The Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Antioch* were there in person; those of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Jerusalem* by their Deputies, and all the *Western* Bishops by three Bishops sent by the Council of *Rome*, with several Bishops of the *East*, whereof the number increased by little and little, as they came to *Constantinople*; for in the beginning they were but between 30. and 40. and in the end there were found above 160. of them.

The Acts of the Council began with the Emperor's Letter to Pope *Donus*; in which he represents to him, his Sorrow to see the *Eastern* Church divided from the *Western*: that *Theodorus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, of blessed Memory, would not send a Synodical Letter to the Holy See, according to the Custom, for fear it should not be received; and that he contented himself to direct a Letter to him, in the Form of an Exhortation: that That Patriarch and *Macarius*'s Patriarch of *Antioch*, being consulted, why the Church was thus divided, seeing all the Bishops received the Definitions of the five General Councils, and the Doctrine of the Fathers, and rejected all Heresies: They answered, the Contest came from some new Expressions, brought in, either out of Ignorance, or out of a Desire of piercing too deep into the unsearchable Works of the Lord: that the Sees of *Rome* and *Constantinople* disagreeing about this, they remained divided. He exhorts the Pope not to suffer this Division, about inconsiderable Points, to continue for ever; and invites him to send some able Legates to the Synod, with necessary Instructions and Books, promising he would cause them to be received, and be equally favourable to both Parties. He tells them, he thinks three Men will be enough to hold his place, with twelve Archbishops or Bishops, in the Name of his Council. He adds, that he had been desired by the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Antioch*, to give them Leave to take *Vitalian*'s Name out of the Dyptichs, and to leave none but that of *Honorius*, because the Bishops of *Rome*, his Successors, had differed from the *Eastern* Churches; but that he would not suffer them to do it: and that he could assure him, that the Names of *Honorius* and *Vitalian* were left in the Dyptichs.

There is a second Letter of the Emperor, dated September 10th. 680. directed to *George* of *Constantinople*; wherein he orders him, immediately to bring the Bishops and Archbishops to *Constantinople*, and to send Word to *Macarius*, to bring likewise those of his Synod.

The third Piece is a *Latin* Letter of *Manfuetus*, Bishop of *Milan*, which he wrote to the Emperor, in the Name of the Synod held at *Milan*; in which he exhorts him to imitate the Zeal of *Constantine* the Great, for the Faith; and beginning with *Arius*'s Heresy, and the *Nicene* Council, he maketh a compendious History of the other Errors, condemned in the five first Councils, held by the Authority of the Christian Emperors: He assures him, that they do hold and maintain the Definitions of those Councils, and the Doctrine of the Holy Orthodox Fathers. To this Letter is annexed their Confession of Faith; in which, having asserted two Natures in Christ, they add, that there be also two natural Wills and two Operations. With these Letters they sent some Deputies from the Pope and the Synod: the Pope sent two Presbyters, named *Theodorus* and *George*, and a Deacon named *John*; and the Bishops of the Council sent three Bishops in their Name to the Synod of *Constantinople*. When these Deputies were arrived at *Constantinople*, and had saluted the Emperor, September 10th. 680. he gave an order, directed to *George* of *Constantinople*, whom he styles *OEcumenical Patriarch*, (as he had styl'd the Pope *OEcumenical Pope*) wherein he commands him immediately to bring the Archbishops and Bishops to *Constantinople*, and to send word to *Macarius* of *Antioch*, to bring those of his Synod.

A. 1.

The first Action of the Council began the 7th. of November, 680. in the Emperor's Palace. It is said,

he presided in the Assembly, that his Counsellors or Officers were present at it, and that the Synod was called by the Emperor's Order. The three Legates of the Pope held the first Place among the Bishops of the Council, *George* Patriarch of *Constantinople* the second, the Deputy of the Church of *Alexandria* the third, *Macarius* of *Antioch* the fourth, the Deputy of the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* the fifth, the Bishops Deputies of the Synod of *Rome* the sixth; next after them were the Deputies of the Church of *Ravenna*, and about 32. Bishops, with some Abbots.

Council III. of Constantinople.

After they were set down, the Legates of the Pope, and of the Synod of the *West* said, that they were sent by the Pope and the Council of *Rome*, and that they brought two Letters with them, which they had delivered to the Emperor: that seeing the Difference came from this, that the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* had invented and maintained Novelties, by teaching, that there was but one Will and one Operation in Christ, those of their Party ought to shew the Grounds of this new Doctrine. *Macarius* answered, in the Name of the Churches of *Constantinople* and *Antioch*, that they had invented no Novelties, and did teach nothing but what they had learn'd from the Holy Fathers, as they are expounded by *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul* and *Peter* their Patriarchs, by *Honorius* Pope of *Rome*, and by *Cyrus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*; that they were ready to defend this Doctrine by the General Synods and the Fathers, whose Authority was owned. The Emperor commanded them to do so, and the Acts of the *OEcumenical* Councils to be brought. Those of the Council of *Ephesus* were read, and *Macarius* thinking to have found there a Place favouring his Opinion in St. *Cyril*'s Letter to *Theodosius*, where Christ's Will is said to be Omnipotent; he would have inferred from thence, that there was but one Will in Christ. But the *Western* Deputies, some Bishops, and the Judges themselves took notice, that the Will of the *Word* only was spoken of there, and not the Divine and Humane Will in Christ; then they read over the Acts of the Council of *Ephesus*.

In the second Session, held the 10th. of November, A. 11. the Acts of the Council of *Chalcedon* were read, and when they came to St. *Leo*'s Letter, the Pope's Legates maintained, that there was a Place where that Pope established two Wills and two Operations. *Macarius* contrariwise affirmed, that the Passage of St. *Leo* proved only, that there was in Christ one Operation *Theandrick*.

In the third, of the 13th. of the same Month, they A. 11. began to read the Acts of the fifth Council: At the Head of which there was a Discourse written under the Name of *Mennas*, to *Vigilius*. The Pope's Legates maintain'd it to be supposititious, and to have been added a little while ago to the Acts of the fifth Council; which they proved, because *Mennas* dyed the 21st. year of *Justinian*, and the fifth Council was not held till in the 27th. year of the same Emperor: And indeed the Judges and the Bishops examining the Sheets which they were reading, they found three prefixed to the beginning without Cyphers, and written by a different Hand. Whereupon they left out that Discourse of *Mennas*, and set themselves to the reading of the Acts of the fifth Council. In them they found a Letter of *Vigilius*, in which he asserted one only Operation in Christ; but the Legates denied it to be his, and when they went on in the reading of the Council, they found that in the Definition there was no mention of one Operation. The reading of the Acts of the Council being finished, the Bishops and the Judges declared, that they had not found it defined, that there was but one Operation and one Will in Christ.

The fourth Action was held the 15th. of the same A. 11. Month: In it the Letters of *Agatho*, and of the Council of *Rome*, to the Emperors *Constantine*, *Heraclius*, and *Tiberius*, were read. The first contains very large Proofs of the Doctrine of the two Wills, taken out of the Holy Scripture and the Fathers: He does plainly condemn the *Monothelites*, and particularly *Theodorus*,

Council III. of Constantinople. *Theodorus, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul and Peter :* He speaks very respectfully of the Emperors, and very advantageously of his own See: He says, the Apostolick Church of *Rome* never fell into Error, that it never was depraved by Heresy: that the Fathers and Synods have followed her Decisions, and that his Predecessors have always confirmed their Brethren in the Faith. They might have opposed to him the late Instance of *Honorius*, who seemed to be as guilty as those he did so severely condemn, and who was not spared in the Council of *Constantinople*. The Letter of the *Roman* Council contains a Confession of Faith, in which they acknowledge two Operations and two Wills in Christ: After that they condemn the Doctrine of the *Monothelites*, and the Bishops condemn'd in *Agatho's* Letter; and they approve what was done in the Synod held under *Martin I.* This Letter is subscribed by 25. Bishops, most of them of *Italy*; there be some of *France* also, and *Wilfride* subscribes in the Name of the Bishops of *England*. They tell us, that they hoped that *Theodorus* of *Canterbury* and several other Bishops, would have come thither, but could not; and that they might be assured that all the Bishops of the *West* and the *North* were in the same Opinion, and held the same Faith.

Act. v. The fifth Action was held the 7th. of *December*. *Macarius* presented two Sheets of Quotations of the Fathers, which were read in the Council.

Act. vi. He presented also a third in the next Action, which was held the 12th. of *February*. The Emperor ordered all the three Sheets to be sealed with the Seals of the Judges of the Church of *Rome*, and the Church of *Constantinople*. The Pope's Deputies maintained, that none of those Testimonies proved one Will or one Operation in Christ; that they had falsified most of them; and that some of them were only to be understood of the Will of the three Persons in the Trinity. They required them to produce the Authentick Books out of which those Passages were taken, that they might lay open the Cheat; and that they might be permitted to peruse the Collection of the Passages they had made, to prove two Wills and two Operations in Christ.

Act. vii. In the seventh Action of the 13th. of *February*, of the year 681. *Agatho's* Deputies presented a Sheet, containing the Testimonies of the Fathers, confirming the Doctrine of the two Wills. They asked *Macarius* if he received *Agatho's* Letter, and the Definition of the Council of *Rome*. *Macarius* and *George* required the Sheet, containing the Passages of the Fathers, might be communicated to them, to compare them with the Originals, which were in the Patriarch of *Constantinople's* Library.

Act. viii. In the eighth Action of the 7th. of *March*, the Bishop of *Constantinople* having examined *Agatho's* Letter, and the Passages of the Fathers, declared that he was of the same Mind with the Pope, and the other Bishops of the *West*. All the Bishops of his Patriarchate made the same Declarations, except *Theodorus* Bishop of *Melitina*; who presented a Memoir in the Name of himself and three Bishops more, of some Officers of the Church of *Constantinople*, and of *Stephen* a Presbyter and Monk of *Antioch*; wherein he requested, that neither Party might be condemned, seeing the General Councils had pronounced nothing hitherto about the two Wills. This Memoir was disowned by those in whose Name it was presented, excepting *Stephen*, the Monk of *Antioch*. Nevertheless, *Constantine* told them, that for the full Satisfaction of the Council, they ought to bring a Profession of Faith in the next Action. Hereupon *George* came near the Emperor, and prayed him, to order *Vitalian's* Name to be put into the Dyptichs again, which had been crossed out, only by reason of the Delay of the *Apocrisarii* of *Rome*, sent to *Constantinople*. The Emperor ordered it to be done forthwith, and his Order was approved by the Exclamations of the Bishops, who wished him a long Life, as also to Pope *Agatho*, and to *George* Patriarch of *Constantinople*. There remained none but *Macarius*

and those of his Patriarchate, who had not declared themselves: the Council having obliged this Patriarch to deliver his Opinion, he declared, that he did not own two Wills nor two Operations in Christ, but one only Operation and one Will *Dei virile*. After that Declaration, he was ordered to rise up out of his Place to make answer: Four Bishops of his Patriarchate forsook him, and received *Agatho's* Letter and Doctrine. They produced two Professions of Faith of *Macarius*. In the latter, which is the longer, after having explained himself very clearly, about the distinction of the two Natures, he says, it is the same Person that acts and suffers; that it is God that acts and suffers by the Manhood, and according to his Divine Will, which only acts in Jesus Christ, it being impossible there should be in him two contrary or like Wills. He adds, for a Proof of his Assertion, that in the celebration of the unbloody Mysteries, in our Churches, we are made Partakers of Christ's Body and Blood, which is not a Man's Flesh, but the quickning Flesh of the Word. He condemns all Hereticks till *Honorius*, *Sergius*, and *Paul*; which he commends as Teachers of the Truth. *Macarius* owns in the Council these Professions of Faith, and protests he will suffer himself to be torn in pieces, or thrown into the Sea, rather than own two Wills and two natural Operations in Christ: then they examined all the Testimonies, which he had alledged, and it was found that he had falsified them; which provoked the Bishops Indignation against him, inso-much that they deposed him.

In the next Action, held the eighth of *March*, they *Act. ix.* went on in the Examination of the Quotations alledged by *Macarius*, and received the Declaration of *Theodorus* of *Melitina*, and of the Bishops and Clerks that had approved his Memoir; wherein they promised to give a Profession of Faith in the next Action.

The tenth Action was held the 18th. of *March*: *Act. x.* they read the Fathers Testimonies, alledged by Pope *Agatho*, which were found right quoted. They received also the Profession of Faith of the four Bishops, suspected of favouring *Macarius's* Party.

In the eleventh Action, which was more numerous than the former, the Deputy of the Church of *Jerusalem* required, that the Synodical Letter of *Sophronius*, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, might be read; which was read: and after that the Writing which *Macarius* had directed to the Emperor, although, contrary to the Custom, he had sent it to *Rome* and to *Sardinia*, before it was read in the Senate. At the end of this Session the Emperor declared, that being called out by State Affairs, he had ordered two Noblemen and two * Exconsuls to be present in his stead at the following Sessions, at which he was not in Person, except the last. *[* Persons who had formerly been Consuls.]*

In the twelfth Action, held the 20th. of *March*, they read a long Memoir of *Macarius's*, containing the Letters of the Bishops of his Party. The first is a Letter of *Sergius* to *Cyrus*, in which he consults him about the Emperor's Prohibition of admitting two Wills in Christ. He answers him, that Question was not decided by any Council; that St. *Cyril* and *Vigilius* own but one Will, yet that the two Wills ought not to be condemned, if it was found that some of the Fathers had spoken of them. *Act. xii.*

The second is a Letter of *Sergius* to Pope *Honorius*, in which he maintains, that they ought to forbear speaking of one or two Wills.

The third is *Honorius's* Answer to the former Letter, which approveth the Suppressing of those Expressions, which he thinks to be new, nothing of them being found in the Scripture, in the Councils, nor in the Fathers. These Letters were examined from the Originals kept at *Constantinople*, and being found true and genuine, it was ordered that they should be examined in the following Actions. The Judges asked the Emperor, Whether *Macarius* might be restored, in case he should repent and alter his Mind. The Council required, that by reason of the heady

heady Zeal which he had shewed, he should remain deposed, without Hope of Restoration, and be banished; and the Clergy of *Antioch* desired another Bishop might be put in his room.

In the thirteenth Session, of the 28th of March, *Sergius* and *Honorius's* Letters were read over again. They declared, that this last had wholly followed *Sergius's* impious Doctrine, and they anathematized him. The Judges asking, Why they did also condemn *Cyrus*, *Pyrhus*, *Peter*, and *Paul*? The Council answered immediately, that their Heresy was manifest, and that Pope *Agatho* did sufficiently discover it. Nevertheless, it was agreed upon, that their Writings should be examined: therefore they immediately read two Letters of *Cyrus* to *Sergius*, the *Capitula* he had got the *Theodosians* to subscribe, some Extracts of his Sermons and of *Theodorus's*, a Writing of *Pyrhus's*, some Letters of *Peter* and *Paul* of *Constantinople*, proving that those Bishops admitted but one Will and one Operation in Jesus Christ; hereupon the Council declared, that *Agatho* had justly condemned them, that they also did condemn them, and reject their Errors, and would have their Names blotted out of the *Dyptichs*. As for the Successors of *Paul*, *Thomas*, *Johis*, and *Constantine*, they read their synodical Letters, and nothing was found in them contrary to the Faith. *George*, Library-keeper of *Constantinople*, swore, that they had not put Men to subscribe, that there was but one Operation in Christ, therefore they were absolved. This Action ended with the reading of the second Letter, directed to *Sergius* and *Cyrus*; in which he does equally reject the Opinions of one or of two Wills in Jesus Christ; and intimateth, that *Sophronius*, Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, promised him to speak no more of two Wills, provided that *Cyrus*, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, would speak no more of one Will.

In the next place they read three Writings, the one, under the Name of *Menndis*, to *Vigilius*, and the other under the Name of *Vigilius*, to the Emperor *Justinian* and the Empress *Theodora*, which they maintained to be supposititious. *George*, the Keeper of the Rolls, or Library-keeper, brought out a Copy of the fifth Council, in which they were not found. It was made appear, that the *Monothelites* had added those Writings, which were not subscribed, as the rest of the Acts of the Council were, and *George*, a Monk of the Patriarchate of *Antioch*, who had written them, having owned his own Hand, declared that *Stephen*, *Macarius's* Disciple, had got him to transcribe those three Writings; telling him, that the Copies of the fifth Council, where they were not found, were defective. *Paul* of *Constantinople* had caused the same Addition to be made to the *Latin* Copy of the fifth Council; which was acknowledged by *Constantine*, a Presbyter, who transcribed it: these Writings were condemned and the Composers of them. Afterward they examined a long Passage of a Sermon of St. *Atbanasius* upon these Words; *Nunc anima mea turbata est valde*; in which the Doctrine of the two Wills is strongly maintained.

In the fifteenth Action, of the 26th of April, *Polychronius*, a Presbyter and Monk, presented a Confession of Faith, signed by him; wherein he owned but one Will in Christ. He said, that he had been confirmed in this Opinion in a Vision, by a tall Man, clad in white, full of Brightness and Majesty, who told him, 'Twas an unchristian thing to think otherwise: He had seduced several Persons, and was so zealous in his Opinion, that he promised to raise a dead Man to Life again, to prove the Truth of his Doctrine; notwithstanding he attempted it in vain, and made himself to be laughed at and to be anathematized by the Council, which deposed him.

In the sixteenth Session, held the 9th of August, *Constantine*, a Presbyter of *Apamea*, the Metropolis of the second *Syria*, being come to give an account of his Faith, said; that he did confess two Natures in Jesus Christ, and the Properties of both his Na-

tures; that he did not question so much as the two Operations, but he could own but one Will of the Word. They asked him, whether he would not admit an humane Will also? He confessed, that Jesus Christ had a natural humane Will till he was crucified, but since his Resurrection he had it no more; and as he put off his Mortal Flesh, his Blood, and the Weakness of the Humane Nature, by the same Reason, he had no more a Humane Will, according to Flesh and Blood. He declared, that *Macarius* was of this Opinion, and persisting in it himself, he was condemned by the Council, as an *Apollinarist*. *George*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, did then require, in his own Name, and in the Name of the Bishops of his Patriarchate, that they would spare, if it were possible, the Names of his Predecessors, and not comprehend them in the *Anathema's*. But the Council declared, that since they had been blotted out of the *Dyptichs*, they ought also to be anathematized every one by Name.

In the seventeenth Action they propounded the Definition of Faith, which was read over again, approved and signed in the eighteenth, held the 16th of September, 681: Indict X. at which the Emperor was present in Person. They received the Definitions of the five first General Councils, and particularly that of the fifth Council against *Origen*, against *Theodorus* of *Mopsuestia*, and against *Theodoret's* Writings, and *Ibas's* Letter. They recite the Creeds of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, and the Council approving the Definition of the Council, held at *Rome*, and *Agatho's* Letter, adds, that there are two Natural Wills and two Operations in Jesus Christ, in one Person, without Division, without Mixture, and without Change. That these two Wills are not contrary, but the Humane Will follows the Divine Will, and is entirely subject to it. It prohibits teaching any other Doctrine, under Pain of Deposition to Bishops and Clerks, and of Excommunication to the Laity.

This Definition is signed by the three Legates of Pope *Agatho*, by *George*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, by the Legate of *Peter* of *Alexandria*, by *Theophanes*, the new Patriarch of *Antioch*, by the Legate of the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, by the Legates of the Archbishops of *Thessalonica*, *Cyprus*, and *Ravenna*, by the Deputies of the Council of *Rome*, and by 160 Bishops. The Emperor asked the Bishops, If this Definition was made and published by the Consent of all. They answered, they were all of this Judgment, that it was the Faith of the Apostles, the Fathers, and the Orthodox. Then they put up many Desires for the Preservation of their Prince, and pronounced *Anathema* against the ancient and modern Hereticks, and among the rest, against *Honorius*, who is always named with the Patriarch *Monothelites*.

The Emperor protested, that he had no other Design, in calling this Council, than the Confirmation of the Orthodox Faith. He exhorted them, that if any of them had any thing to add to the Definition, which was newly published, they should alledge it. Then all the Bishops having approved it again, they read a Discourse, addressed to the Emperor, in the Name of the Council, signed by all the Bishops, containing many Praises of his Piety and Religion. Then they prayed him to subscribe the Definition of Faith; he promised to do it, desired the Council to receive a Bishop of *Sardinia*, called *Citonatus*, who had been accused of attempting something against his Prince and the State, but was found innocent: The Council did it willingly. This is the Abridgment of the Acts of the sixth Council, of which the Emperor caused five Copies to be made for the five Patriarchal Churches.

The Bishops of this Council, before their Departure, sent a Letter to Pope *Agatho*, in which they tell him; that being, as he was, the first Bishop of the Universal Church, they rely upon him for what remains to be done; that they have received and approved his Letter; that they made use of it to overthrow the Foundations of the new Heresy; that they

Council
III. of
Constantinople.

have anathematized as Hereticks, *Theodorus of Pharan*, *Sergius*, *Honorius*, *Cyrus*, *Paul*, *Pyrrhus* and *Peter*; and have condemned and deposed *Macarius*, late Patriarch of *Antioch*, as also his Disciples *Stephen*, and *Polychronius*, who maintained the same Impieties. They all shew their grief, that they have been forced to come to this. Lastly, they say, that he will learn more at large by the Acts of the Council, and from his Legates, in what manner they have defended the Faith, which he had established in his Letter. This Letter is signed by four Patriarchs, or their Deputies, by the Bishop of *Thessalonica*, by the Deputy of the Metropolitan of *Cyprus*, by the Metropolitan of *Cesarea* in *Cappadocia*, Primate of *Pontus*, by *Citennatus*, Bishop of *Cagliari*, by the Deputy of the Council of *Rome*, by thirty one Metropolitans in their own Name, and in the Name of the Bishops of their Province, and by thirteen Bishops.

The Emperor, presently after the Council, set out an Edict against the *Monothelites*, wherein he maketh a Confession of Faith agreeable to that of the Council; he condemns *Honorius*, as having supported *Cyrus* and *Sergius's* Heresie in every thing, and he appoints divers punishments against those that shall be found maintaining this Error, Deposition, or rather Suspension, against Clerks and Monks; Proscription, and Deprivation of Employments, against Persons constituted in Charge and Dignity, and Banishment from all the Towns of the Empire, against private Persons.

Agatho being Dead in 682. *Constantine* writ to *Leo* the Second, his Successor. In this Letter he commends *Agatho's*; he tells him, that *Macarius* was the only Man that would not yield to the Decision of the Council, notwithstanding all his endeavours to recover him from his Error. He exhorts him to excommunicate all those that shall be found in the Error of the *Monothelites*, and prays him to send some Apocrisiaries to *Constantinople*, to be his Representatives there, and to act in his stead in all Ecclesiastical Affairs, both concerning the Discipline, and the Faith. He wrote also a Letter to the Bishops that had been present at the Council of *Rome*, where he speaks of the Union of the Bishops of the Council about the Faith, and the condemnation of *Macarius*. *Leo* confirmed by his Answer the Definition of the Council, and condemned *Honorius* by Name. Lastly, *Justinian* confirmed this sixth Council by a Letter written to Pope *John* in 687, and caused the Acts of it to be sealed in the presence of a great number of Clerks and Laymen, that there might be no alteration made in it.

I need not enlarge here on the defence of the Acts of the Council, from the injurious Aspersions of *Piggius*, and the groundless Suspicions of *Baronius*. These Writers, devoted to the Court of *Rome*, could not endure to see Pope *Honorius's* Name among the Hereticks condemned in this Council; and that was the cause, that moved the one openly to attack the Acts of the Council very rudely, and the other to charge them with Corruption. But the former says nothing against this Council, but what might be said against the first *Nicene* Council, and that of *Chalcedon*; all his Objections being grounded upon the Emperor's being present in this Council, with his Officers, and his appointing the order and manner of proceeding. It cannot be denied, but *Constantine* the First did the same in the *Nicene* Council; and in that of *Chalcedon*, the Emperor's Commissioners took more Authority upon themselves, and concern'd themselves more in the doings of that Council, than the Emperor himself had done in this. And so he cannot touch and blemish this Council, without aspersing the other Councils at the same time; and would utterly overthrow the most solid Grounds of our Faith, that he may support a pretended Infallibility in *Honorius's* Person.

As to *Baronius's* Fancy, it is founded upon such frivolous Conjectures, confuted by so Authentical Proofs, that it hath been abandoned by all those that

have not blindly followed that Author. He supposes, that *Theodorus*, *George's* Predecessor in the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, having been condemned and deposed by the Council, had razed his own Name out of all the Acts of that Council, to put in *Honorius's*. But there can be nothing worse contrived than this Hypothesis.

For first of all, 'tis a groundless supposition, that *Theodorus* was anathematized or deposed for *Monothelism* in the Council. It is evident, that he was not Bishop of *Constantinople*, when the Council began; no Author says, he was deposed or expelled for that Heresie; neither is it probable, that it was the cause of his leaving his See, seeing *George*, who was put in his room, was also a *Monothelite*.

Secondly, put the case *Theodorus* had been condemned by the Council, how is it likely, that he durst have ventured to falsifie the Acts of the Council itself? And tho' he durst do it, it had been enough for him to cross out his own Name, without substituting that of *Honorius*; and put even the case, he could have taken that Resolution, can it be thought, that he could have brought it about? How could he falsifie all the Copies of the Acts of this Council, sent out to all the Patriarchal Sees? How could he bring the Emperor, the other Patriarchs, and all the Bishops, to consent to this Cheat? Why did not the Legates and the Popes complain of this Falsification? Why did they acknowledge after, that *Honorius* was condemned in the 6th. Council? Why did they not discover this Imposture by the Copy of the Acts of the Council, which the Deputy of the Holy See brought, and which the Popes, *Agatho's* Successors, communicated to the Western Bishops, and which he sent into *Spain*? If they were corrupted, when he brought them, why did he suffer that Corruption? And why did the Popes use them? If they were not corrupted, why did they not use them, to discover the Fraud of the Enemies of the Holy See?

Thirdly, *Honorius* is found condemned in some places, where they could not have spoken of *Theodorus*. In the 13th. Action, his Letter to *Sergius* is particularly censured, as contrary to the Apostolick Doctrine and the Definitions of the Councils. It cannot be said, this was spoken of *Theodorus*. In the 14th. Action, his Letter to *Sergius* is again condemned, as perfectly agreeable to the Doctrines of the Hereticks. In the 18th. Action, his Letter is condemned to be burnt, as containing the same Heresie, and Impieties, as the other Writings of the *Monothelites*. In the same Session, he is condemned together with *Sergius*; *Anathema* to *Sergius* and *Honorius*, and after, *Anathema* to *Pyrrhus* and *Paul*. If *Theodorus's* Name had been put in the room of *Honorius's*, they would not have placed him before *Pyrrhus* and *Paul*, but after them; Lastly, he is almost every where called Bishop of *Rome*. All this shews, there is nothing more unwarrantable than *Baronius's* conjecture.

Fourthly, 'tis a plain matter of Fact, that *Honorius* was condemned in the 6th. Council. And of this we have proofs more than sufficient. The Council it self owns it in its Letter to the Pope; the Emperor in his Edict declares it. *Agatho*, who was one of the Notaries, testifieth it in a Relation which is in the end of a Manuscript of the 6th. Council. *Leo* the Second, *Agatho's* Successor, asserts it in three of his Letters; the whole Church of *Rome* acknowledges it in the Forms of the Oath, which the Popes newly elected are to take, and in her ancient Liturgy, the two General Councils following look upon this Condemnation as true. Lastly, no Body ever questioned it, and consequently, *Baronius's* Fancy must pass for a matchless piece of rashness. You will yet be more sensible of it, when you shall see the weakness of the Proofs, whereon he founds his bold Conjecture. The first is a place of Pope *Agatho's* Letter, which says, the Apostolick Church of *Rome* did never swerve from the way of the Truth, and that his Predecessors did always confirm the Faith of their Brethren. This Letter, says he, having been read and approved in the

Council
III. of
Constantinople.

Council
III. of
Constantinople.

the Council, how is it likely, that after this they durst have condemned one of *Agatho's* Predecessors as an Heretick, or Favourer of Heresie? If this Pope's Letter had contained but that one Point, or it had been read in the Council to justify *Honorius*, this Objection might have some strength. But this being said, but by the by in *Agatho's* Letter, containing a long Exposition of the Faith of the Catholick Church, and a very great number of the Fathers Testimonies and Reasons against the Error of the *Monothelites*; and the Council having caused it to be read, on purpose only, to know the Doctrine of the Holy See, and the Western Churches: It is evident, their approbation does not fall upon this particular place of his Letter, but upon the Exposition of Faith, and the Doctrine it contained. And tho' we should suppose, that the Council had taken notice of the Commendation which *Agatho* maketh of his Church, and his Predecessors, and had perceived that it was not absolutely and strictly true, they ought not upon this account to have refused their approbation of his Letter, nor excepted against this place of it. It were a silly thing to imagine, that a Council, called to decide a Question of Faith, should busie it self to wrangle about a Commendation slip in by the Pope in his Letter in behalf of his Predecessors. But Pope *Agatho's* praises of his Predecessors in general ought not to be taken in a strict Sense; for if we understand them so, all the World will see that they cannot be true; because it cannot be denied, but *Liberius* and *Honorius* did but weakly defend the Faith, as well as tolerate Error; they must then be understood in general of almost all *Agatho's* Predecessors, and not of all in particular, so that no exception could be made to it.

Besides, it were an easie thing to retort *Baronius's* Argument upon himself. For if the commendations of *Agatho's* Letter ought to be taken strictly, as also the Council's approbation of it, so that it was not lawful for them to condemn those whose Religion and Piety he commends: How durst *Baronius* charge the Emperor *Justinian* with Heresie, Perfidiousness, and Impiety, since he is commended in *Agatho's* Letter, as a most Religious, Orthodox, and Godly Prince, whose Memory is had in Veneration among all Nations?

But I stand too long upon so weak an Objection. He makes one more, which is not harder to solve. How is it possible, saith he, that the Pope's Legates who were present in this Council, should say nothing to vindicate *Honorius*? But, why would he have them, to engage in a bad cause? *Honorius* had approved *Sergius's* Letter, had consented, that they should speak neither of One nor Two Operations, had asserted but One Will in Christ, had silenced *Sophronius*, who would have defended the Faith. These Facts were evident by the very reading of his Letter; there is enough for his condemnation; and they could not stand up in his defence without furnishing their Adversaries with Arms. The same Reasons which they should have used to justify him, might have been urged also to justify *Sergius* and the rest; therefore in forsaking *Honorius*, they took the right course; they did the same thing in the Roman Council under *Martin* the 1st, for when they read *Paul's* Synodical Letter who defends his own Error, by the Authority of *Honorius*, neither the Pope, nor any of the Bishops, did think of vindicating him nor of maintaining him to have been of another mind. But if he thinks it strange, that the Legates should suffer *Honorius's* Memory to be condemned; how much more strange must it seem to be, that they should have suffered the Acts of the Council to be falsified, to insert his condemnation in it? Tho' *Honorius* had been excusable, they might have had reasons not to oppose his condemnation; the advantage of Peace, and the fear to cause some trouble might have prevailed with them to acquiesce in the Judgment of the Council: But no reason can be found to excuse their Treachery, if they had corrupted the

Acts of the Council to insert *Honorius's* condemnation there.

I do not trouble my self to confute *Baronius's* other Reasons, which are a meer begging of the Question, having already said over-much on that subject; because now his Opinion of the corruption of the Acts of the 6th Council is wholly forsaken; and it goes now for current, that *Honorius* was condemned in the 6th Council. This being supposed; there remain two Questions to be examined, whether he was justly condemned, or not; and for what reason he was condemned.

To decide these Questions, there needs no more than to read *Sergius* and *Honorius's* Letters, and to remember the circumstances of the Fact. *Cyrus* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, that he might re-unite the *Theodosians*, approved this Expression, that there was but one Operation in Christ; *Sophronius* opposed this Doctrine; *Sergius* approved the Conduct and Doctrine of *Cyrus*; but for Peace sake, he did think it better, not to debate this Question, and neither to affirm one nor two Operations in Christ, and only to say, that the same Person performed Divine and Humane Actions; because they that use the expression of one Operation only, seem to confound the two Natures; and when they say two Operations, they seem to assert two contrary Wills in Christ, which cannot be maintained, by reason the Soul of Christ never had any motion of its own from it self, or contrary to those of the Word, but such as the Word pleased, and when he pleased. In a word, that, as our Body is governed and moved by our Soul, so the Soul of Jesus Christ was led and governed by his Divinity. Thus *Sergius* explains himself in his Letter to *Honorius*, and asks him what was his Opinion about it.

What does this Pope answer to this? He approves of *Sergius's* proceeding; he commends his Letter, he follows his Opinion; he forbids speaking any more of one or two Operations of Christ, and orders that this Question be left to the *Grammarians* to be discussed; yea, and he declares, that there is but one Will in Christ. Then he writes to *Eulogius*, that he should maintain no longer two Operations in Christ. He writes moreover a second Letter to *Sergius*, to command silence about that Question. What did *Sergius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul*, and the other *Monothelites*, who were condemned in this Council, do more? They were in two Errors, 1. That we ought not to assert, that there was one or two Operations in Christ, and that we should forbear debating that Question. 2. That we should say, that there is but one Will in Christ, by Reason the Soul of Christ was governed and led by his Divinity. *Honorius* does plainly establish those two Points; therefore he cannot be excused, without excusing also the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*. You will say, that when he said there was but one Will in Christ, he said it to exclude the contrariety of Wills; and that the reason he gives of it, does evidently shew it. We own, saith he, there is but one Will in Christ, because he took upon him our Nature, not our Sin; and he had no other Law in his Members, nor any contrary Will. But if this reason may serve for the vindication of *Honorius*, *Sergius* ought to be vindicated likewise, as rendering the same reason, and confessing in his Letter, that the Soul of Christ had its proper motions, directed and led by the Divinity. *Paul*, his Successor, may with much more reason be excused; for in his Letter to *Theodorus*, he says, that the only reason, why he acknowledges but one Will in Christ, is out of fear, lest he should admit a contrariety of Wills in Christ, or should say, that there be two Persons with two different Wills; that he did admit but one Will, not to annihilate the Humane Nature, or any part of his Soul, but to shew that Christ's Soul was filled with the gifts of the Deity, and had no Will contrary to that of the Word. By the same reason one may justify the *Ecthesis*, and the Type, and all the *Monothelites*: For they did not deny, that the Body and Soul

Council
III. of
Constantinople.

Council III. of Constantinople. of Christ had all their Properties, their Faculties, and Motions; but they affirmed, they were so governed and led by the Will of the *Word*, as to follow his direction and impression in all things. And the only reason they gave, why they would not have Men to say, that there were two Wills in Christ, was for fear this expression should intimate two contrary Wills in him. *Honorius* therefore is no more excusable than *Sergius*, *Paul*, and the other *Monothelites*, who did act and speak as he did; and if they condemned these as Hereticks, they might condemn *Honorius* likewise. Wherefore not only the 6th. Council always joined him with the other *Monothelites*, and comprehended him in the same *Anathema*; which they would not have done, had they believed, there was any difference to be made between him and the rest; for it is expressly said, 'They condemned him, for delivering in his Letter things contrary to the Doctrine of the Apostles, the Definitions of the Councils, and the Judgment of all the Fathers, and for following the false Doctrine of Hereticks, for approving in every thing the Impious Opinions of *Sergius* for writing a Letter tending to the same Impiety, for Preaching, Teaching, and Spreading the Heresie of one Operation, and one Will.'

In fine, the Council having pronounced *Anathema's* against *Theodorus*, *Sergius*, *Honorius*, *Pyrrhus*, *Paul*, *Macarius*, and *Stephen*, *Polychronius* adds, *Anathema* to all these Hereticks. They did then believe *Honorius* to be an Heretick, as well as the rest, and condemned him as such.

But, say they, in the Emperor's Edict, he is called only a Favourer, Helper, and Confirmer of Heresie. Pope *Leo* the second, in his three Letters, charges him only with favouring the Error of the *Monothelites*, and not suppressing it with a vigilancy becoming St. *Peter's* Successor. But what maketh most for *Honorius's* vindication, is, that the Abbot *John*, who writ his Letter, St. *Maximus*, and *John IV.* do defend him, and say, that when he asserted but one Will in Christ, he meant it of the Humane Will; but he did not mean, that there was but one Will of the Manhood, and Godhead. That's the most plausible thing can be said in the behalf of *Honorius*; but all this doth not prove, that he was not condemned as an Heretick, and Favourer of Heresie. *Honorius* was a Favourer of Heresie, because he forbade speaking both of one, and two Operations in Jesus Christ. He was an Heretick, because he owned but one Will in Jesus Christ.

Besides, one is often a Favourer of Heresie, by teaching it; and that name is given to those who

maintain an Heresie invented by others. 'Tis in this Sense, *Constantine* says, *Honorius* was a Favourer of Heresie. *Sergius* was the Author of this Doctrine, but *Honorius* approved, confirmed and embraced it; wherefore he calls him (ὁμοούσιος σου αὐτοῦ τοῦ ὁμοούσιου) the proper Terms not only for him who neglects to stifle a new springing Heresie, but for him also who does formally approve, embrace and teach it. Tho' *Leo II.* was concerned to be tender of his Predecessor's reputation, and for that reason he expressed, in more gentle Terms, the cause of *Honorius's* condemnation, yet he confesseth, that *Honorius* did not only favour the new Heresie by his Silence and Negligence, but moreover, that he did suffer the Apostolick Tradition to be sullied and defiled by a contrary Doctrine. *Qui Apostolicam Ecclesiam non Apostolicæ Traditionis doctrina illustravit; sed profana proditiōe immaculatam maculari permisit*: And in another Letter, *Maculari consensit*. And the Roman Church hath so plainly acknowledged, that Pope *Honorius* did advance the Error of the *Monothelites*, that in her ancient Breviary, she declares, that he was condemned with the other *Monothelites*, for maintaining the Doctrine of one Will.

Lastly, *Adrian II.* taketh notice, that he was condemned by the Synod, because he was charged with Heresie, which he affirms to be the only cause for which he believeth a Council may judge the Pope. It cannot be doubted then, but that *Honorius* was condemned by the 6th. Council, as an Heretick, yea, and that the Council had as much reason to censure him, as *Sergius*, *Paul*, *Peter*, and the other Patriarchs of *Constantinople*; and that his Letter was as fit to be condemned, as the *Ecthesis* and the Type. It's true, *John* the Abbot, who wrote it, and *John IV.* defend *Honorius's* Letter, and endeavour to put a good Interpretation upon it; but this was before the Council had condemned it, and they were concerned then in the defence of it. The Greek Church did more than this in favour of *Sergius*; for notwithstanding the condemnation of the 6th. Council, she put into the Office of a Festival, kept in Lent, a Story, in which this Patriarch is mentioned as a Saint. But we see, it's more just and rational, to give credit to the judgment of a General Council, where Matters are examined to the bottom, than to the Sentiments of some private Men, who judge of this Fact, according to their own Interest or Prejudices. This will stand for certain then, that *Honorius* was condemned and justly too, as an Heretick, by the 6th. Council.

[† Concilium Cabillonense.]

Of Challon.

[* Rotomagus.]
[† Agendicum.]

The Council of † Challon upon the River Saone.

CLOVIS II. called a Council at *Challon* upon the River *Saone*, (a) the 6th. year of his Reign, which is the 650. of the vulgar Æra. It was made up of the (b) Archbishops of *Lyons*, *Vienna*, * *Rouen*, † *Sens* and *Bourges*, and of (c) 39 Bishops of France. They made 20 Canons.

In the 1st. they decree, that they shall hold the Doctrine established by the Councils of *Nice* and *Chalcedon*.

In the 2d. that the Canons shall be kept.

The 3d. renews the Prohibitions made to the Clergy against having strange Women.

The 4th. forbids ordaining two Bishops at the same time in the same City.

The 5th. decrees, that the Administration of Parishes, or of Church-lands, shall not be committed to the Laity.

The 6th. forbids seizing on, or taking Possession of Church-lands, * before it be so ordered.

The 7th. forbids Bishops, Archdeacons and any other Person, to take away any of the Goods or Estate

belonging to a Parish, Hospital or a Monastery, after the death of the Presbyter who governed it.

The 8th. declares the necessity of Repentance, and orders Bishops to impose Penance upon them that confess their Sins.

The 9th. forbids selling Christian-slaves to Strangers or Jews.

The 10th. declares that a Bishop ought to be chosen by the Bishops of the Province, by the Clergy and the Citizens; and says, an Ordination, made otherwise, is null.

The 11th. decrees, that the Bishops shall separate from their Communion those Judges, who would assume a Jurisdiction over the Parishes and Monasteries, where the Bishops make their visit.

The 12th. forbids making two Abbots in one Monastery, to avoid division and scandal among the Friars. Nevertheless, if an Abbot will chuse himself a Successor, he may do it; but he that is chosen, shall not dispose of the Estate of the Monastery.

[(a) The 6th. Year of his Reign, which is the 650.] The Year is not certainly known; but it is sure it was held before the Year 658.

[(b) Archbishops.] They have signed in the same Order in which we set them down.

[(c) 39 Bishops.] Of which six were Deputies.

The

Council of
Challon.

The 13th. renews the Inhibition made to Bishops to keep the Clerks of their Brethren, or to ordain any Body without his Bishop's leave.

The 14th. provides a remedy against an Abuse which was grown common. The Lords of the places, where there were Chappels, sought to hinder the Archdeacons and Bishops from the cognizance of what concerned the Clerks, that ministred in those Chappels. This Council decrees, that the Ordination of the Clerks, and the disposal of the Revenues of those Chappels shall belong to the Bishop, that Divine Service may be regularly performed there.

The 15th. prohibits Abbots and Friars making use of the Protection of the Seculars, and going to the Prince, without their Bishop's leave.

The 16th. declareth, that they who give Money to be made Bishops, Priests or Deacons, shall be deprived of the Dignity that they would have purchased.

The 17th. forbids raising Tumults or Quarrels in the Church, or at the Church-doors.

The 18th. prohibits Plowing, shearing Corn, Reaping or Tilling the Ground on Sundays.

The 19th. prohibits Dancing and Singing lewd Songs within the Church-yards or in the Church-porches, upon Saints Festivals.

The 20th. degrades *Agapius* and *Bobon*, Bishops of *Digne*, for having done many things contrary to the Canons.

The Bishops of this Council wrote a Letter to *Theodosius* or *Theodorick*, Bishop of *Arles*, in which they acquainted him, that having met together by King *Clovis's* order, in the Town of *Challon*, they did stay for him, hearing he was got near the Town; that the only thing that hindered his appearing, was, that he heard himself to be accused of living dishonestly, and doing several things contrary to the Canons; that they had also seen a Writing signed with his own Hand, and by the Bishops of his Province, wherein it appeared, that he had submitted himself to Penance; that he knew, that those that were come so far, cannot keep nor govern a Bishoprick any longer. Wherefore, they declare to him, that he must abstain from doing any Episcopal Function in *Arles*, and from receiving the Church Revenues, till he receive his tryal before the Bishops.

Council of
Challon.

The eighth Council of Toledo.

Of
Toledo.

Al. Receswinthe.

THIS Council of 52 Bishops of *Spain*, was called by an order from King * *Receswinthe*, in the year 653. Its Constitutions are in the form of Acts, very obscure, written in a barbarous Style, and full of false Notions. They begin with King *Receswinthe's* Letter to the Bishops of the Synod, wherein he exhorts them to follow the Faith of the first four General Councils; to provide against the Disorders that would happen, if they should execute the Oath they had taken, of putting all those to death that should be found to be concerned in any Conspiracy, against the Prince or State; to re-establish the discipline of the ancient Canons; and to regulate those Matters that shall be brought before them. The Bishops obeying the King's Order, professed themselves to hold the Decisions of the Councils and the Fathers; they read the Creed, which was then recited in the solemn Service of the Churches of *Spain*, which is that of the Council of *Constantinople*, to which they had superadded, that the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father and the Son. Then they made a long Discourse upon Oaths, and cited many Places of the Scripture and the Fathers, to shew, that Men ought not to keep nor execute the Oaths, wherewith they have sworn to commit wicked Actions, and prejudicial to the State. The third Canon is against those that use Intreaties and Prayers, to obtain the Priesthood. They are declared Excommunicate, and those that do confer or receive Orders thus, are deprived of their Dignity; these last are likewise put to Penance in a Monastery. The three next Canons are made to keep the Clergy pure and chaste. The 7th. is against an Abuse by which some Persons ordained Bishops or Presbyters, did think themselves free to leave the Priesthood, under pretence, that in their receiving it, they had

said that they would not receive it: the Council declares, that this cannot be done; and that, as Baptism conferred on Persons unwilling to receive it, and on Children who know nothing of it, is valid; so likewise Ordination ought to subsist, being as indelible as Baptism, the Holy Chrism and the Consecration of the Altars: So they decree, that they, who after their Ordination, shall return to the World and marry, shall be banished out of the Church; and shut up in a Monastery, to do Penance there all their Life. The 8th. Constitution prohibits ordaining, hereafter, any Clerk that knows not the Psalter, the Anthems, the Hymns in use, and the Ceremonies of Baptism; and that if any of them that are ordained, be ignorant of these things, they shall be constrained to learn them. The 9th. forbids eating Flesh in *Lent*, and orders, that those that have need of eating of it shall ask the Bishop's Leave. The 10th. Constitution is concerning the Election of Kings, and the Qualifications they ought to have. the 11th. confirms the ancient Canons of Councils. The 12th. confirms the Decree of the Council of *Toledo*, held under King *Sisenand*, about the Security of Kings. They conclude with pious Wishes for King *Receswinthe*, and with a general Confirmation of the preceding Constitutions. The Acts are subscribed not only by fifty two Bishops, but by nine Abbots besides, and ten Presbyters or Deacons, Deputies of Bishops, and sixteen Lords. Moreover, there is another Decree of this Council, about the disposing of Kings Revenues, which is confirm'd by an Edict of King *Receswinthe*. The Jewish Converts presented a Petition to this Council, wherein they bound themselves, sincerely to renounce the Jewish Doctrine and Ceremonies.

Of
Toledo.

The ninth Council of Toledo.

Of
Toledo.

TWO Years after, the same King *Receswinthe* called a Provincial Council, the Bishops whereof willing to renew the ancient Discipline, and to publish the Canons of the Councils, thought they ought to begin by making Laws to reform themselves: for, say they, in the Preface, it would not become Superiors to go about to judge their Inferiors, before they have judged themselves by the Laws of Justice it self. Judgments are more just by far, when the Life of the Judges is well ordered; and when their Virtue is known, their Judgment is better submitted to.

VOL. II.

Therefore, they 1st. forbid the Bishops, and others of the Clergy, to appropriate to themselves the Lands given to Churches; and give leave to the Relations and Heirs of the Legatees, to apply themselves to the Bishop or Metropolitan, to hinder the Lands given by their Relations from being converted to private uses.

Secondly, to prevent the ruine of Parish-Churches and Monasteries, they give leave to those that built them, to take care of them, and to recommend to the Bishop some Persons to govern them, whom he shall be bound to ordain, if he finds them capable of that

Of
Toledo.

* * E

that Office. This was one beginning of Lay-Patrons.

The ninth Council of Toledo.

Thirdly, it is ordered, that if the Bishop, or any other of the Clergy (to pay the Churches Debts) alienates some part of his Church-Lands under the Titles of Patrimony, he shall be bound to set down in the Deed the cause of his doing so, to the end, that it may appear, whether it be done justly or fraudulently.

Fourthly, they decree, that if Bishops have but a small Patrimony, the Purchases they make ought to be for the Profit of the Church; but if the Revenue of their own Patrimony be found to be as great as that of their Bishoprick, their Heirs shall divide their Estate in half, or according to the proportion of their own and the Church Patrimony. Lastly, that they may, during their Life, dispose of what falls to them by Donation; but if they do not dispose of it, after their Decease, those Donations shall belong to the Church.

In the 5th. they declare, that the Bishop that will build a Monastery in his Diocese, shall endow it only with the fiftieth part of the Revenue of his Bishoprick, and with the hundredth if it be but a Church only.

In the 6th. that he may forgive Parochial Churches the third part of the Revenues which they owe him, and that such Release shall be perpetual and irrevocable.

For the more punctual execution of these Canons, by the 7th. Constitution, they forbid the Heirs of the Bishop to enter upon their Inheritance, without the Consent of the Metropolitan, or if he be a Metropolitan, before he hath a Successor, or there

be a Council assembled. And likewise they forbid the Heirs of Presbyters and Deacons to take possession of their Inheritance, without the Cognizance of the Bishop.

In the 8th. Canon they declare, that the Prescription of thirty years shall not be reckoned against the Church, as to the Lands alienated by any Bishop, but from the day of that Bishop's Death, and not from the day of the date of the Deed.

In the 9th. they forbid a Bishop who cometh to bury his Brother, to take above the value of a Pound of Gold, if the Church be rich, or of half a Pound if she be poor; and orders him to send the Inventory which he shall make, to the Metropolitan.

In the 10th. they declare the Sons of Clergymen, who were obliged to Celibacy, incapable of Inheriting.

The six following Canons are concerning Ecclesiastical Persons or such as are made free by the Churches, and are not now in use.

The 17th. and last lays an Obligation upon the Jews, who are newly converted, to be present on their ancient Feast-days, in the Towns and Assemblies of Christians, kept by the Bishop.

They conclude with making pious Wishes for King *Receswinthe*. They appoint the next Council on the first of *November* following. This Council is signed by *Eugenius* of *Toledo* and 15. Bishops, by 3 Abbots, by the Deputy of a Bishop and 4 Lords.

Therefore we ought not to wonder that these Councils should make Laws about Political Matters, because they are properly Assemblies of the States, authorized by the Prince in which the Civil Authority was joyned to the Ecclesiastical Power.

The tenth Council of Toledo in 656.

The tenth Council of Toledo.

THIS Council was held a month later than it had been appointed: It made seven Canons.

In the 1st. the Festival of the Virgin was appointed to be kept eight Days before *Christmas*.

By the 2d. the Clerks or Monks, which shall be found to have violated the Oaths taken to the King and the State, are deprived of their Dignity, yet so as that it shall be free for the Prince to restore them to it, if he thinks fit.

By the 3d. Bishops are forbidden to give Parochial Churches or Monasteries to their Kindred or Friends, to enjoy the Revenues of them.

In the 4th. it is ordered, that Women who have embraced the state of Widowhood, ought to make Profession of it, in Writing, before the Bishop or the Presbyter, to take the Habit of it, to keep it on always, and to wear a Veil of a Black or Violet Colour.

The 5th. decrees, that those who leave the Habit of Widowhood, after they have worn it, shall be excommunicated, and shut up in Monasteries.

The 6th orders, that those Children, whom their Parents caused to take the Tonsure, or the Religious Habit, shall be obliged to lead a Religious Life: That, nevertheless, Parents cannot offer their Children, before they be ten years old, and after that Age the Childrens Consent is necessary.

The last Canon contains an Advertisement, to dissuade Christians from selling their Slaves to the Jews.

There was presented to this Council a Confession in Writing from *Potamius* Bishop of *Braga*, who was accused of many Crimes. They brought him before the Council; he owned that Writing, declared himself deeply guilty of those Faults; and said, that nine Months since he had relinquished the Government of his Church, and shut himself up in a Prison, to do Penance. The Council being informed that he had had the carnal Knowledge of a Woman, they declared, that although, according to the Ancient Rules, he was to be wholly degraded, and deprived of his Dignity, yet, out of compassion, they left him the Title and the Degree of a Bishop, but they would have him to do Penance all his Life-time, and they did chuse *Fruetusius*, Bishop of *Dumes*, to govern the Church of *Braga* in his room. This Decree is put after the Canons of the Council; and to it is annexed another Decree, dissanulling the Bequests of a Will, made by *Recimer* Bishop of *Dumes*, to the Prejudice of his Church.

This Council is subscribed by 3 Metropolitans, *Eugenius* of *Toledo*, *Fugitinus* of *Sevil*, *Fruetusius* of *Braga*, by 17 Bishops and 5 Bishops Deputies.

A Conference held in Northumberland, in 664.

The Northumbrian Conference.

THE chief occasion of this Conference, related by *Beda*, l. 3. c. 25. of his History, was the Dispute about *Easter-day*. *Colman* maintained the Practice of the *Britains*, and *Wilfride* that of the *Romans*. King *Oswy* was present at it. *Wilfride* founded his Practice upon the universal Custom of the Church, which kept *Easter* on the same Day, excepting the *Picts* and the *Britains*. *Colman* would have defended their Practice by the Authority of *St. John*. But *Wilfride* shewed him, that he did not agree with this Apostle, who kept *Easter* with-

out staying for the *Sunday*; which they did not follow, seeing they staid till the *Sunday* next after the fourteenth Moon. That they did not agree with *St. Peter* neither, for this Holy Apostle kept *Easter* between the 15th, and 21st, Moon, whereas they would keep it from the 14th, to the 20th, so that they did sometimes begin this Feast at the end of the thirteenth Moon. *Colman* alledged, for his Defence, the Authority of *Anatolius*, *Columba* and the Ancients of his Country. *Wilfride* answered, that they did not agree with *Anatolius*, who made use of the Cycle of

of nineteen years, which they were strangers to, because that Author's Opinion was not that *Easter* was necessarily to be kept before the 21st Moon, but that he had mistaken the fourteenth Moon for the fifteenth, and the twentieth for the twenty first. As to *Columba* and his Successors, he would not condemn them; that he was persuaded they might be excused for their Simplicity, in a Time when no body was able to instruct them: But, as for them, they could have no Excuse, if they refused the Instructions given them. However, that *Columba's* Authority was not to be preferred before *St. Peter's*, to whom Christ gave the Keys of the Church, and said, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*

The King struck with these last words, ask'd *Colman* if it was true, that Christ said so to *St. Peter*? *Colman* having confessed it was true, the King said; that seeing *St. Peter*, was the Door-keeper of Heaven, he would not contradict him, but would obey his Statutes.

This Decision was approved by the Company: *Colman* and his Men withdrew, refusing to yield to the Practice of the *Romans*, about the keeping of *Easter* and the Tonsure, about which there was also a Contest: Men take such delight in Disputes about small Things.

The Council of Merida †.

THIS Council, made up of the Bishops of the Province of *Portugal*, was assembled by the Order of King *Recceswinthe*, in the Year 666. After having prayed for the King, they recited the Creed, with the addition, of the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son.

Then they decree, that on Holy Days they shall say *Vespers* in their Churches, before they sing what they call the *Sound*, that is, the *Venite Exultemus*, which is thus called, because it was sung with a loud sounding Voice.

In the third Chapter they ordain, that whenever the King shall go to the Army, the Bishops shall offer every Day the Sacrifice, and put up Prayers for him and his till his Return.

They decree in the fourth that Bishops, after their Ordination, shall give a Writing, whereby they shall bind themselves to a chaste, sober and honest Life. The Metropolitans were to send this Writing to the Bishops of their Province, and the Bishops to their Metropolitan.

By the 5th. Bishops are enjoined to come to the Synod, at the Time appointed by the Metropolitan's Letters, and the King's Order. If any of them be detained by Sickness, he is permitted to send a Presbyter for his Representative, but they will not have him to depute a Deacon.

Moreover it is decreed by the 6th. that the *Suffragan* Bishops, which shall be sent for by the Metropolitan, to come and keep *Christmas* and *Easter* with him, shall be bound to obey his Orders.

The 7th. renews the Law of holding every Year a Council, and the Penalties laid upon the Bishops that do not come to it.

In the 8th. it is mentioned, that King *Recceswinthe* hath re-establish'd the Rights of the Province of *Portugal* and its *Metropolis*: And then it says, that *Selva* Bishop of *Indane* had made his Complaint, that *Justus* Bishop of *Salamanca* had invaded his Diocese, and demanded Restitution of what belonged to him. It was ordained, that Surveyors shall be sent to compose this Difference, because there had not been thirty Years possession. In the end Bishops are warned to look well to the Preservation of what belongs to their Dioceses; and it is decreed, that 30 Years Possession shall go for a Title.

By the 9th. Canon, he to whom the Holy Christ is sent, is forbidden to take any thing for his Distribution of it; and Presbyters are forbidden exacting any thing for Baptizing; but they are permitted to take what shall be freely given to them.

The 10th. enjoins every Bishop to have an Archpriest, an Archdeacon and a Secretary; and these Officers are enjoyn'd to be subject to their Bishops,

and to undertake nothing above their Power, under Pain of Excommunication.

The 11th. orders the Priests, Abbots, Curates, and Deacons, to be subject to their Bishops, to pay them their Dues, to entertain them in their Visitations, and to undertake no Business without their Consent.

By the 12th. a Bishop is permitted to take Parish Priests and Clerks into his Cathedral Church, yet so that they shall not lose their Title, nor the Revenue of their Livings, provided that another Priest or Clerk shall be put in their Room, with a competent Maintenance.

The 13th. impowers the Bishop to prefer the Clerks, who discharge their Duty well, and to deprive them of this Advantage, if they abuse it.

The 14th. decrees, that all the Money offered on Holy Days, in Churches, shall be gather'd together and put into the Bishop's Hands; who shall divide it into three parts, the one for himself, the other for the Priests and Deacons, and the rest for the other Clerks.

The 15th. orders the manner of punishing Church-Servants, that it be done agreeably to the Ecclesiastical Gentleness and Lenity.

By the 16th. the Bishops of the Province of *Portugal* are forbidden to appropriate to themselves the third part of the Church's Revenue, and are ordered to employ it in the Repairing of the Churches.

The 17th. appoints Penalties for those who speak ill of their Bishops after their Death.

By the 18th. Parsons are enjoyn'd to have Clerks.

The 19th. enjoins Presbyters, charged with the Care of several Churches, to say Mass in every one of them every Sunday, and to recite the Names of those that built them, whether they be alive or dead.

The 20th. contains some Constitutions about the bestowing Freedom on the Slaves of the Church.

The 21st. decrees, that the Donations, made by a Bishop, shall stand, when the Church is found to have got more by his Estate, than he gave by his Will.

By the 22^d. it is decreed, that those that will not observe these Decrees, shall be excommunicated.

This Council ended, as all the preceding Councils of *Spain*, with Wishes and Prayers for King *Recceswinthe*. It is subscribed by the Archbishop of *Merida*, and 11. Suffragan Bishops; which are the Bishops of *Indane*, of *Pace*, now *Bece*, of *Avila*, of *Lisbon*, of *Lamega*, of *Salamanca*, of *Conimbra*, of *Gauria*, of *Oxonobe*, now *Istombar*, of *Elbora*, now *Talaverre*, and of *Calabria*, now *Setuval*; which we do now take notice of, because there was some Difference since between the Metropolitan of *Braga* and that of *Merida*, about 3. of those Churches, viz. *Conimbra*, *Lamega*, and *Indane*.

A Council of Autun.

ST. Leger, Bishop of *Autun*, held a Council in this City, in which he made some Constitutions for Monks; wherein they are ordered,

to appropriate nothing to themselves, not to be seen in Towns, to obey their Abbots, to let no Woman come into their Monasteries, to suffer no Vagabond

A Conference held in Northumberland, in 664.

[† Concilium Emeritense.]

Of Merida.

Of Autun.

Council of Autun. Friars, to keep St. *Benedict's* Rules, and exactly to discharge their Duty: It appoints different Penalties against Transgressors, among which is reckoned the Bastinado for simple Friars. Some place this Council in 663. others in 670. and some others in 666. because in his last Will it is said, that in the 7th. year of his Pontificate, which answers the 666th. year of

Christ, he was present at a Council of 54. Bishops: But those 54. Bishops did not meet at *Autun*, but in a Place named *Gibrifnac*; and the Constitutions above-mentioned, are intitled, in the old Collection of the Church of *Angers*, *Canons of the Council of Autun*.

A Council of Hereford in England.

Of Hereford. This Council was held in 673. by *Theodorus* of *Canterbury*, who read and promulged there 10.

Canons, of which we spake, when we treated of this Father's Works.

The eleventh Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. This Council, held in 675. begins with a long Exposition of Faith, upon the Trinity and the Incarnation. The 1st. Canon is of the Modesty and Order to be kept in the Council.

The 2d. enjoins Metropolitans to be diligent in instructing of their Suffragans.

The 3d. enjoins all the Bishops of the same Province, to observe the same Rites and Ceremonies in the Publick Service, and to conform themselves to the Metropolitan Church, from which they receive their Consecration. Abbots likewise are enjoyn'd, in the Publick Service, to follow the Use of the Cathedral Church.

The 4th. forbids receiving the Oblations, or suffering the Bishops that are at Variance to come near the Altar before they be reconcil'd.

The 5th. is to prevent the Attempts and Excesses the Bishops might commit, by reason of their Authority.

By the 6th. Clerks are forbidden to be present in Capital Judgments, or to punish any Body with Loss of Limbs.

The 7th. forbids Bishops to put any Body to Penance, but according to the Publick Order of the Church, or in the presence of Witnesses.

The 8th. prohibits taking any thing, even of what is freely offered for Baptism, the Holy Chrism, or Holy Orders.

The 9th. enjoins him, who is ordained Bishop, to give Oath before the Altar, that he neither did nor will give any thing to be chosen Bishop.

The 10th. enjoins those that take Orders to bind themselves under their Hand, to keep inviolably to the Faith of the Church, to live a good Life, to do nothing contrary to the Ecclesiastical Laws, and to be obedient to their Superiors.

The 11th. excuses those whom Illness causes to cast up the Eucharist, and condemns them that do it out of Impiety.

The 12th. ordains, that those shall be reconciled who desire Penance, being in Danger of Death, and that Commemoration be made of those, and their Oblation be received, who die after they have been admitted to Penance, by the Imposition of Hands, tho' they have not been reconciled.

The 13th. forbids those who are possessed by the Devil, or stirred with violent Motions, to wait on the Altar, or to come near it, to receive the Sacraments: Yet those are excepted who fall down out of Weakness or Illness, without any other Symptom.

The 14th. orders, that there shall always be some Body assisting to the Priest, whilst he is singing the Service or celebrating the Holy Sacrifice, to the end that, if he should fall ill, another might take his Place.

The 15th. renews the Constitutions about the holding of Councils.

The Council concludes with wishes for the Prosperity of King * *Wamba*.

It is subscribed by the Archbishop of *Toledo*, by 16. Bishops, 2. Deacons, Bishops Deputies, and 7. Abbots.

The fourth Council of Braga.

Of Braga. THE same year, and under the same King, was held a Council in *Braga*. The Bishops having recited the *Nicene* Creed, with the Addition of the Holy Ghost's proceeding from the Father and the Son, do condemn some Abuses which had crept into the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries: Some offered Milk, others Grapes instead of Wine; some gave to the People the Eucharist dipped in Wine: Some Priests would make use of the Sacred Vessels to eat and drink in; others said Mass without a Stole on: Some hung about their Necks Relicks of Martyrs, and then made themselves to be carried about by Deacons, with their Albes on. Several Bishops accompanied with Women, and some misused their Clerks; Simony was a common thing. They made Canons against all those Disorders.

By the 1st. they forbid offering Milk and Grapes, in lieu of Wine, and dipping the Eucharist in the Wine.

The 2d. prohibits putting Sacred Vessels and Ornaments to prophane and common Uses.

By the 3d. it is ordered, that Priests shall celebrate

the Holy Mysteries with a Stole only, which shall cover their Shoulders, and go down, cross-wise, over the Stomach.

By the 4th. Ecclesiastical Persons are forbidden to dwell with a Woman, excepting their Mother only, but not their very Sisters, nor any other near Relations.

The 5th. declares, it belongs to the Deacons to carry the Relicks of Martyrs; and that if the Bishop will carry them, he shall go afoot, and not be carried by the Deacons.

The 6th. forbids Bishops to cause the Priests, Abbots or Deacons under him to be beaten.

The 7th. prohibits Simony, and for that purpose renews the Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*.

The last forbids Bishops to take more care of their own Patrimony than of the Church's; and if this happens to be embezell'd by their Negligence, whilst the other is improved, they shall be bound to make up the Loss out of their own.

This Council is sign'd by 8. Bishops.

The twelfth Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. This Council was held in 681. under King * *Ervigius*. The Metropolitans of *Toledo*, *Sevil*, *Braga*, and *Merida*, were present in it,

together with thirty Bishops, four Abbots, three Bishops Deputies, and several Lords. King *Ervigius* came to it at the beginning of it, and withdrew after having

having made a short Speech to the Council. He left them a Memoir, wherein he exhorted them to absolve the Guilty, to reform Manners, to re-establish Discipline, to renew the Laws made against the Jews, to procure the Restoration of those who had been degraded, by virtue of a Law of his Predecessor, for not bearing Arms, or for laying them down. He directs his Speech to the Bishops and the Lords, that these Laws being made by the unanimous consent of both Spiritual and Temporal Authority, they may stand firm, and be put in execution.

The Council, having, according to the Custom, made a protestation, that they did receive the Faith of the first four Councils, and recited the Creed, approves *Erwigius's* Elevation to the Throne, and *Wamba's* Deposition, who had withdrawn himself by taking a Religious Habit, shaving his Head, and chusing King *Erwigius* to reign in his stead, and causing him to be consecrated by the *Sacerdotal* Unction. It is very remarkable, that the Fathers of this Council do not depose King *Wamba*, nor chuse *Erwigius* of their own accord. But after having seen the Declaration, which that Prince had made in Writing, and signed in the presence of the Lords, whereby he had made profession of the Religious Life, and got his Hair cut; and that whereby he desired, that *Erwigius* might be chosen King; and the order he had given to the Bishop of *Toledo*, to consecrate *Erwigius* with the usual Ceremonies; and the Verbal Process of that Consecration, signed by *Wamba*, they join their consent to *Wamba's*, and approve of what he hath done, and consequently declare, that *Erwigius* ought to be owned for their lawful King, and in that Quality to be obeyed, upon pain of *Anathema*.

The 2d. Canon binds those, who receive Penance in the extremity of Sickness, and when they are not sensible, to lead a Penitent Life, if they recover. Yet they will have the Priest to give Penance to those only that desire it; they give the instance of Childrens Baptism, to shew that Penance may be given to those who are not sensible.

The 3d. ordains, that those that have been excommunicated for some Crime against the State, shall be restored when the Prince taketh them into his favour again, or they have the Honour to eat at his Table.

In the 4th. the Bishop of *Merida* having represented, that King *Wamba* had constrained him to ordain a Bishop in a Country-Town, and essayed to do the same thing in other places: They recited the Canons forbidding to ordain Bishops in Burroughs, or to put two in the same City; by virtue whereof they declared, that the Ordination of him, whom *Wamba* caused to be Ordained, was irregular: but seeing it was not out of Ambition that he had been Ordained, but by the Prince's express Orders, they out of mere favour granted him the next vacant Bishoprick; and they make a general Inhibition, to ordain Bishops in places where there were none before.

The 5th. forbids Priests to offer the Holy Sacrifice without Communicating, because some of those who offered it many times in one Day, would not communicate but at their last Mass.

The 6th. to prevent the long vacancy of Churches, permits the Archbishop of *Toledo* to ordain him whom the King shall chuse, yet without any prejudice to the Rights of Provinces; and upon condition, that within three Months after his Ordination he shall present himself before his Metropolitan.

The 7th. declares, that whereas King *Erwigius* intends to moderate the Law made by his Predecessor *Wamba*, against them that had not taken Arms; it was their Opinion, that such Persons had a Right to bear Witness, and were not to be rejected as infamous.

By the 8th. Husbands are forbidden to leave their Wives, except for Adultery.

The 9th. renews several Constitutions against the *Jeres*.

The 10th. grants the Right of the Sanctuary to those who escape into Churches, or within thirty Yards about, provided nevertheless, that they shall be delivered back into their Hands, who shall promise with an Oath not to hurt them.

The 11th. Canon does severely punish Superstitions and Idolatry.

The 12th. renews the Law for holding a Council every Year.

The 13th. contains Wishes and Prayers for the Prince.

These Canons are confirmed by a Declaration of King *Erwigius*.

The thirteenth Council of Toledo.

THIS Council was also holden under King *Erwigius*, (*An. 683.*) The same Metropolitans assisted at it, together with forty four Bishops, twenty four Deputies of other Bishops, eight Abbots, and twenty six Lords. They read the Memoir sent to them by King *Erwigius*, containing the Heads of such matters as he would have to be regulated by them. Then they made a Confession of Faith, and recited the Creed, according to the custom. The three first Canons respect Secular Affairs, and confirm what the Prince had done.

The 1st. is a Pardon in favour of those who had formerly conspired with *Paul* against the State.

The 2d. is a Determination of the manner how to proceed against the Lords of the Court, accused of Capital Matters, and how to judge them.

And the 3d. is about the remitting of the extraordinary Taxes granted to *Erwigius*. These three Canons are all of the first Day.

The next day the Bishops being desirous to shew their Gratitude to their Prince for the favours he had bestowed upon them, provided for the Security of his Children and Family.

By the 4th. Canon, and by the 5th. they forbid any Person Marrying his Widow.

The 6th. prohibits advancing to the Offices of the Court Slaves, or Free-Men, unless they belong to the Exchequer.

VOL. II.

The 7th. forbidsto uncloth the Altars, take away the Wax-Candles, adorn the Church in a Mournful manner, or to cease to offer the Sacrifice, without great necessity.

The 8th. orders Bishops to come, when sent for by their Metropolitan, to be present at some Festival.

The 9th. confirms and repeats compendiously the Canons of the 12th. Council of *Toledo*.

The 10th. made in the 3d. Meeting of the Council, is concerning a difficult case proposed by *Gaudentius* Bishop of *Paleria*, or *Villareo*, who being fallen Sick had subjected himself to the Laws of Penance. He desired to know, whether, in case he recovered, he might execute his Function, and celebrate the Holy Mysteries. The Council ordains, that he may, after he is reconciled, because the Canons permit those who being at the point of Death, have indeed received Penance, but yet have confessed no Crimes, to be admitted into the Clergy. Upon this Principle, they make a general Law, that the Bishops, who have received Penance, without confessing any Mortal Sins, being reconciled by their Metropolitan, may return to their Functions. Notwithstanding, if they had been convicted of any Crimes, before they were put to Penance, or if they have confessed some capital Sins upon their receiving of it, they shall abstain from their Functions, as long

* * *

29

The thirteenth Council of Toledo. as the Metropolitan shall think fit. But if in submitting themselves to Penance they confessed no Mortal Sin, tho' they have committed some, which they conceal in their own Conscience, they have the liberty to examine themselves in their own Conscience, whether they should offer the Sacrifice, or not: But this depends upon their own Will, and not upon Mens Judgment.

The 11th. Canon prohibits keeping or entertaining another Bishop's Clerk, or helping his escape, or affording him means of hiding himself. It is observed there, that those ought not to be reckoned among Fugitives, who go to their Metropolitan about their own business.

It is ordained contrary-wise by the 12th. Canon, that the Clerk, who having some business with his Bishop, betakes himself to the Metropolitan, ought

The thirteenth Council of Toledo. not to be excommunicated by his Bishop, before the Metropolitan hath judged whether he deserves Excommunication. Likewise, if a Clerk pretending himself to be wrong'd by his Metropolitan, betaketh himself to another Metropolitan; or if, both the Metropolitans refusing to do him Justice, he hath recourse to the Prince he shall not be excommunicated before his Cause be judged. Yet, if he who appeals to the Synod, to the next Metropolitan, or to the King, be found to have been excommunicated, before he brought his Matters before them, he shall remain excommunicate till he hath cleared himself.

The 13th. contains Thanksgiving to King *Ervigius*, and some Petitions to Heaven for him.

This Prince set out an Edict, whereby he confirmed these Canons, after the recitation of them.

The fourteenth Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. THIS Council was called by King *Ervigius*, (*Anno*. 684.) to approve what had been done against the Error of the *Monothelites*, which they call the Doctrine of *Apollinaris*. He intended to call a General Council of his whole Kingdom for this purpose; but time not permitting it, the Bishop

Of Toledo. of *Toledo* assembled his Suffragans; and the Metropolitans of *Tarragona*, *Narbonne*, *Merida*, *Braga*, and *Sevil*, sent their Deputies thither. In this Council they approved the Acts of that of *Constantinople*, and added an Exposition of Faith, wherein they did acknowledge two Wills in Jesus Christ.

The fifteenth Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. [* Alias *Egyfca.*] THIS Council was held under King * *Egica*, *Ervigius's* Successor, and Son-in-law, (*An*. 688.) and composed of sixty Bishops. In this Council they justify themselves about some Articles of the Exposition of Faith, which the *Spanish* Bishops had sent to *Rome* by *Peter* a Presbyter, which Articles Pope *Benedict* had found fault with.

The first is about their saying, that the Will had begotten a Will. They defend this Expression, because the Eternal Will of God is common to the three Persons, as well as Wisdom, and other Divine Attributes; so that as Wisdom may be said to have begotten Wisdom, the Will likewise may be said to have begotten a Will; they also defend this Expression by some Testimonies of *St. Athanasius*, and *St. Austine*.

The second is about their saying, that there were three Substances in Jesus Christ. They maintain, that Jesus Christ being composed of a Body, a Soul, and the Godhead, he may be said to be of three Substances in this Sense, tho' the Body and Humane Soul being taken but for one Nature and one Substance, two Natures and two Substances only may be said to

Of Toledo. be in him. They shew, that *St. Cyril*, and *St. Austine*, did speak as they did. They do not enlarge upon the other two Articles, thinking it sufficient to observe, that they are taken out of *St. Ambrose*, and *St. Fulgentius*. Afterwards they treat of the Oaths taken by King *Egica*. He had made one to King *Ervigius*, to defend and protect his Children against all Persons whatsoever; and another at his Consecration, to administer Justice to his People. It was demanded, that in case these two Oaths should be found to interfere with one another, and that *Ervigius's* Children were to be protected against Right and Justice, and to be rescued from the Punishment due to them for Wrongs done by them, whether the King be bound to keep the first, or the last Oath. The Council answers, He is more strictly bound to keep the last, as being more just, more solemn and necessary. This Council is signed by the Metropolitans of *Toledo*, *Narbonne*, *Sevil*, *Braga*, and *Merida*, by fifty six of their Suffragans in Person, by the Deputies of six, among whom was *Iva* the Arch-Bishop of *Tarragona*, by eleven Abbots, by seventeen Lords, and confirmed by the King's Declaration.

The Council of Saragosa.

Of Saragosa. THIS Council was assembled under King *Egica*, *Anno*. 691. It made five Canons. By the 1st. Bishops are forbidden to consecrate Churches but on *Sundays*.

The 2d. orders the Bishops to enquire of their Metropolitan, or Primate, about *Easter-Day*, and to keep it upon the Day he shall appoint.

The 3d. forbids Monks to admit Secular Persons into their Cloysters.

The 4th. ordains that the Church-Slaves, freed by their Bishop, shall be bound to exhibit to his Suc-

Of Saragosa. cessor their Letters of Freedom within a Year after the Death of the Bishop that set them at Liberty; provided they have been warned to do so.

The 5th. renews what had been decreed by the Council of *Toledo*, that the King's Widow should not marry again; and ordains moreover, that she shall withdraw into a Convent, and take the Religious Habit, immediately after the Prince's Death.

The Council ends with Thanksgivings, and Prayers for the King.

The sixteenth Council of Toledo.

Of Toledo. THIS Council was kept in 693. under the same King *Egica*. After the reading of the Memoir, containing the Proposal of what was to be treated in the Council, the Bishops made a long Exposition of Faith, which is followed with twelve Canons.

The 1st. is in the behalf of the *Jewish* Converts, to exempt them from the Tribute which they paid to the Exchequer.

Of Toledo. The 2d. is against the remainders of Idolatry.

The 3d. appoints very severe Punishments against the *Sodomites*, and excludes them from the Communion until the time of Death, when they have not done Penance being in health.

The 4th. is against them that fall into some Fit of Despair.

The 5th. forbids Bishops to take above the third part of the Churches Revenues, and orders them to lay

The sixteenth Council of Toledo. lay it out in Repairs. It prohibits also giving the Government of many Churches to one Priest, and ordains, that small Churches shall be united to greater ones.

The 6th. forbids an Abuse crept in among some *Spanish* Priests, who at the Sacrifice upon the Altar did not offer clean and decent Loaves, nor prepare them carefully; but did only consecrate a Crust of their own Bread cut round. The Council to stop this Abuse, ordains, that the Bread, to be consecrated upon the Altar, shall be whole, decent, made on purpose, that it shall not be a very great Loaf, but of a reasonable bigness, *Modica oblata*, the remainders of which may easily be preserved, and which may not load the Stomach.

The 7th. commands, that Bishops shall call their Clergy and the People together for the promulgation of the Canons of Councils within six months after the holding of the Councils.

The 8th. contains several Constitutions for the safety of the Kings Children, and ordains, that every Day, Sacrifices shall be offered up for the Health and Prosperity of the King, and the Royal Family, except the Day of the Passion, when Altars are uncovered, and no body is permitted to say Mass.

The 9th. is against *Sisbert*, Bishop of *Toledo*, who had broken his Oath to King *Egica*, by conspiring against his Person and Family: they depose and excommunicate him for his whole Life, they declare his Goods to be confiscated to the Prince, and condemn him to perpetual Imprisonment. They decree the same Punishment against all that are guilty of the same Crime.

The 10th. pronounces three times *Anathema* against them that attempt against the Life of Kings, and plot against them and the State, and reduces them and their Posterity to the condition of Slaves.

The 11th. contains some Prayers for King *Egica's* Prosperity.

By the 12th. they put *Felix*, Bishop of *Sevil*, into the room of *Sisbert* newly deposed, and *Faustin*, Bishop of *Braga*, into *Felix's* room, and to *Faustin* they substitute another Bishop.

The 13th. ordains, that a Council shall be held at *Narbone* to approve the Canons of this; because the Bishops of this Province could not come to it by reason of a Sickness. This Council is confirmed by the Prince's Edict, and signed by Five Metropolitans, viz. those of *Toledo*, *Sevil*, *Merida*, *Tarragona*, and *Braga*, by fifty two Bishops, three Bishop's Deputies, five Abbots, and Sixteen Counts or Lords.

The seventeenth Council of Toledo, held in 694.

Of Toledo. THIS Council hath the same Form with the preceding. King *Egica* presented a Memoir, which the Bishops of the Council having read, they recited the Creed, and made the following Canons.

1st. That they shall fast three Days, in Honour of the Holy Trinity, before they begin any Conference in Councils.

2dly. That in the beginning of *Lent* the Bishop shall shut the Font, and seal it with his Ring till Holy Thursday, to let People know, that no Body ought to be Baptized during that time, but in case of extreme necessity.

3dly. They ordain, that the Ceremony of washing of Feet shall be used on Holy Thursday.

4thly. They renew the prohibition of putting Sacred Vessels to Prophane Uses.

5thly. They condemn to Excommunication, and perpetual Imprisonment, those Priests that say the

Masses of the Dead for the Living, out of a conceit that this Sacrifice will bring them to their Death.

6thly. They re-establish the ancient custom to make Litanies, or Publick Prayers, every month for the Church, the King's Health, the Good of the State, and the Remission of Sins.

7thly. They provide for the Security of the King's Children, that no Body may attempt against their Life, or Estate, after his decease.

8thly. They ordain, that the *Jews*, who being Baptized remained in their Religion, yea, and conspired against the Prince, shall be made Slaves, and all their Estates confiscated, that they shall be hindered from using their Ceremonies, and their Children shall be taken away from them to be brought up in the Christian Religion.

Lastly, They return their thanks to King *Egica*, who confirms their Canons by his Edict.

A Council held at Constantinople, Anno 692, called Quini-Sextum, or, In Trullo.

Of Constantinople. THE fifth and sixth General Councils having made no Canons about Discipline, *Justinian* the Second thought fit to call a Council, to renew the old Canons, and to make a kind of a Body of the Canon-Law, for the Clergy of all the East.

This Council was held in 692. at *Constantinople* in the Tower of the Emperor's Palace, called *Trullus*. The four Patriarchs of the East were present at it, together with 108. Bishops of their Patriarchates. This Council was called *Quini-Sextum*, because it was look'd upon as a Supplement to the fifth and sixth Councils. It took the Name of General Council, and the *Greeks* owned it for such, but the *Latins* rejected it. It made 102. Canons.

In the 1st. it approves all that was done in the first six General Councils, condemns the Errors and the Persons they had condemned, and pronounces *Anathema* to those that hold any other Doctrine, than that they have established.

In the 2d. the Bishops of this Council deliver the number of Canons which they received, which are the Constitutions attributed to *Clemens*, the Canons of the Councils of *Nice*, *Ancyra*, *Neo-Cæsarea*, *Gangra*, *Antioch*, *Laodicea*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, *Chalcedon*, *Sardica*, and *Carthage*. The Canons made in

the time of *Nectarius* at *Constantinople*, and in the time of *Theophilus* at *Alexandria*; the Canons of *Denys*, and *Peter* of *Alexandria*, of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, of *St. Athanasius*, *St. Basil*, *St. Gregory Nyssen*, *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, of *Amphilochius*, *Timothy*, and *Theophilus* of *Alexandria*, *St. Cyril*, *Gennadius* of *Constantinople*, and the Canon of *St. Cyprian*, and his Council, which is only observed in *Africa*, according to their Custom.

The 3d. Canon is concerning those of the Clergy, Presbyters or Deacons, that had married two Wives. They declare, that those that would not leave that Custom shall be deposed; but as to those, whose second Wives are dead, or who have left them, they shall keep the honour and place of their Dignity, being forbidden only to perform the Functions of it; it being not fitting, say they, that he that ought to heal his own Wounds, should bless others: As for them who had married Widows, or had married, being Priests, Deacons, or Subdeacons, they ordain, they shall for a time be suspended from their Functions, but they grant them the Power of being restored, when they leave their Wives, upon condition, that they shall not be raised to a superior Order. And lastly, they ordain, that, for the future, all those that

Council of Constantinople. have been married twice after Baptism, or have had Concubines, shall not be made Bishops, Priests, Deacons, or Clergymen; as also those that have married, divorced or prostituted Women, or Slaves, or Stage-players.

The 4th. Canon inflicts the punishment of Deposition upon such Ecclesiastical Persons as shall company with a Virgin consecrated to God, and of Excommunication upon Laymen.

The 5th. renews the Canon which forbids Clerks to have with them Women, not related to them, except those which the Canons allow them to dwell withal. It extends this Prohibition to the Eunuchs.

The 6th. forbids those that are in Orders, including the Subdeacons, to marry after their Ordination.

The 7th. forbids Deacons to sit down before a Presbyter, unless they represent the Person of the Patriarch or Metropolitan.

The 8th. ordains, that a Synod shall be kept at least once a year in each Province.

The 9th. forbids Clerks to keep a Tavern, or to resort thither.

The 10th. forbids them to lend upon Usury.

The 11th. forbids them having any Commerce or Familiarity with the Jews.

The 12th. ties the Bishops of *Africa* and *Lybia* to the Law of the Celibacy.

The 13th. prohibits the Separation of Presbyters, Deacons or Subdeacons from their Wives, or binding them to Continency, before they be ordained.

The 14th. renews the Canon, ordaining, that he who is made a Priest shall be 30. years old at least, and a Deacon 25.

The 15th. decrees, that he who is ordained Subdeacon, be at least 20. years old.

The 16th. declares, that the seven Deacons, spoken of in the *Acts of the Apostles*, were but Ministers of common Tables, and not of Altars; and thereby rejects the Canon of the Council of *Neo-caesarea*, which by the Authority of this Place had ordained, that there should be but seven Deacons in every Church.

The 17th. forbids Clerks to go out of their Churches, without Dimissory Letters from their Bishops.

The 18th. enjoins those who were forced to withdraw because of the Incursions of the *Barbarians*, or for any other cause, to come back again, as soon as they can.

The 19th. enjoins those who govern Churches, to preach to those committed to their care, the Doctrine of the Church, and to expound the Scripture agreeably to the Sentiments of the Fathers.

The 20th. forbids Bishops to preach in a Church, which is out of their Diocess.

The 21st. gives permission to Clerks deposed, if they repent of their Fault, to wear short Hair, like other Clerks: But if they lead a secular Life, it binds them to wear long Hair, like other Laymen.

The 22^d. ordains, that they shall be deposed that have been ordained for Money.

The 23^d. prohibits exacting Money for the Distribution of the Holy Communion.

The 24th. forbids Clerks to be present at the Shows of Stage-players.

The 25th. ordains, that Country Parishes shall belong to the Bishop who had them in Possession 30. years ago; and if before 30. years Possession any will prove them not to belong to them, the Matter shall be examined in the Provincial Council.

The 26th. renews the Prohibition made to a Priest, engaged in an unlawful Marriage, to execute his Function.

The 27th. forbids Clerks to wear any other Garb than such as belongs to their Order, and separateth for a Week those that do.

The 28th. forbids distributing with the Oblation the Grapes offered at the Altar, by reason the Oblation ought to be given to the People for the Sanctification and Remission of Sins, whereas Fruits are only blessed and distributed for Thanksgivings.

The 29th. ordains, that, according to the Council of *Carthage*, the Mysteries shall be celebrated fasting, not excepting *Holy Thursday* itself.

The 30th. ordains, that the Bishops of Churches in barbarous Countries, if they will leave their Wives, shall dwell no longer with them.

The 31st. forbids Clerks to baptize, or to celebrate the Mysteries in Chappels of private Houses, without the Bishop's consent.

The 32^d. condemns the Practice of the *Armenians*, who put no Water into the Wine which they did consecrate.

The 33^d. rejects another Custom of the same *Armenians*, who admitted none into the Clergy but those of a Sacerdotal Race, and made them Clerks and Readers without cutting their Hair. The Council does not allow that regard should be had to the Race of those that are ordained, but only to their Merit; and forbids the Readers to read publickly in the Church, without their Hair cut, and without receiving the Blessing of the Pastor of the Church.

The 34th. decrees the Penalty of Deposition against caballing Clerks.

The 35th. forbids a Metropolitan to seize on the Estate of a Bishop deceased, or on his Church; and appoints that they shall be in the Keeping of the Clerks, till there be another Bishop, unless there be no Clerks, in which case the Metropolitan shall keep them for the Successor.

The 36th. renews the Canons of the Councils of *Constantinople* and *Chalcedon*, concerning the Authority of the See of the Church of *Constantinople*, and grants to it the same Privileges as to the See of old *Rome*, the same Authority in Ecclesiastical Affairs, and the 2^d. place, the 3^d. to that of *Alexandria*, the 4th. to that of *Antioch*, and the 5th. to that of *Jerusalem*.

The 37th. preserveth to the Bishops, ordained into Churches, which have been invaded by the *Barbarians*, the Dignity and Rank of Bishops, and permits them to perform their Functions.

The 38th. renews the 12th. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*; whereby it is ordained, that the Disposition of Churches shall follow that of the Empire.

The 39th. preserveth to the Metropolitan of *Cyprus*, (who was forced to withdraw by reason of that Island's being taken by the *Barbarians*, and was come to settle in the new *Justinianopolis*) they preserve him, I say, the Right of Supremacy, and the Government of the Churches of the *Hellepont*; with the Right of being chosen by the Bishops subject to it, according to the ancient Custom. They do also subject to him the Bishop of *Cyzicum*.

The 40th. declares, that they may receive a Monk in the 10th. year of his Age.

The 41st. ordains, that those who will be *Recluses* or *Anchorets*, ought to have been three years at least in a Monastery.

The 42^d. forbids to suffer Hermits to be in Towns.

The 43^d. imports, that all kind of People may be admitted into Monasteries, even the greatest Sinners, by reason Monachism is a state of Penance.

The 44th. is against Monks guilty of Fornication or married.

The 45th. forbids to dress with worldly Apparel and Ornaments the Virgins that consecrate themselves to God, when they go to take the Religious Habit.

The 46th. forbids Friars and Nuns to go out of their Monastery, without the Superior's Leave.

The 47th. forbids Friars to lie in the Monasteries of Virgins, and Virgins to dwell in the Monasteries of Friars.

The 48th. ordains, that the Wife of him who shall be made Bishop shall be put away from him, and shall withdraw into a Monastery, at a distance from the Bishop's Residence.

The 49th. prohibits converting Religious Houses to profane uses.

The 50th. forbids those of the Clergy and the Laity

Council of Constantinople.

Council of Constantinople. Laity to play at any Games of hazard, upon pain of Deposition and Excommunication.

The 51st. forbids Jesters, Dancers and Shows.

The 52^d. ordains, that the * *Mass of the Presanctified* shall be celebrated every Day in Lent, except Saturday and Sunday, and Lady-day.

The 53^d. forbids them that stood Sureties for Children, to marry the Mother of such Infants.

The 54th. prohibits marrying the Uncle's Daughter: Forbids a Father and a Son to marry the Mother and the Daughter, or two Sisters; as also a Mother and a Daughter to marry the Father and Son, or two Brothers, upon Penalty of 7 years Penance.

The 55th. ordains, that the Canon forbidding to fast on Saturday and Sunday, shall be observed in the Church of Rome, as well as in other Churches.

The 56th. forbids eating Eggs and Cheese in Lent.

The 57th. forbids offering Milk and Honey on the Altar.

The 58th. forbids Laymen to give to themselves the Eucharist, before a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon.

The 59th. forbids baptizing in Domestick Chapels.

The 60th. is against them who feign themselves to be possessed.

The 61st. is against Superstitions.

The 62^d. against the Fooleries which were acted on New-year's-day.

The 63^d. condemns to the Fire the false Stories of Martyrs, made by the Enemies of the Church.

The 64th. imports, that the Laity ought not to undertake to teach Religious Matters.

The 65th. is against the Custom of kindling Fires before Houses on the New Moons.

The 66th. ordains, that Easter Week shall be spent in Prayer.

The 67th. forbids eating the Blood of Beasts.

The 68th. forbids burning, tearing, or giving to Victuallers the Books of the Gospels, if they be not quite spoiled.

The 69th. forbids the Laity to enter within the Rails of the Altar; yet the Emperor is excepted, who, according to an old Custom, is permitted to enter in, when he is willing to make some Oblation to the Lord.

The 70th. forbids Women to talk in the time of the Holy Sacrifice.

The 71st. is against some prophane Practices of Students in the Law.

The 72^d. declares the Marriages between an Orthodox Christian and an Heretick to be null and void.

The 73^d. ordains, that Reverence shall be paid to the Cross; and that Crosses shall not be suffer'd to be made on the Floor.

The 74th. forbids making the Feasts, call'd *Agape*, in Churches.

The 75th. ordains, that they shall sing in the Church without Straining or Bawling, modestly and attentively.

The 76th. enjoins, that no Tavern or Tradesman's Shop shall be suffer'd to stand within the Inclosure of the Church.

The 77th. that Men ought not to bathe with Women.

The 78th. that they ought to instruct those that are to be baptized.

Council of Constantinople. The 79th. is against an Abuse of some, who at Christmas made Cakes to the Honour of the Virgin's Lying-in.

The 80th. is against them that without Cause absent themselves for 3. Sundays together from their own Church, whether they be of the Clergy or of the Laity.

The 81st. pronounces *Anathema* to those that have added these Words to the *Trisagion*: *Thou that hast been crucified for us.*

The 82^d. approves of the Pictures, in which Christ is painted in the Form of a Lamb.

The 83^d. forbids giving the Eucharist to the Dead.

The 84th. orders them to be re-baptized, who can bring no Witnesses, nor certain Proofs that they have been baptized.

The 85th. grants Liberty to the Slaves which their Masters have freed before two or three Witnesses.

The 86th. condemns the infamous Company of debauch'd Women.

The 87th. is against Divorces made without lawful Cause.

The 88th. forbids bringing Horses into the Church without great Need and evident Danger.

The 89th. shews, that they ought to fast on Good-Friday, till Midnight.

The 90th. renews the Law of not kneeling on Sunday.

The 91st. condemns to the Punishment of Murderers those Women that procure Abortions.

The 92^d. is against Ravishers.

The 93^d. condemns the Marriages of those Men or Women who are not sure of the Death of their Wives or Husbands: But after those Marriages have been contracted, and when the first Husband comes again, he is ordered to take his Wife again.

The 94th. is against those that use the Oath of Pagans.

The 95th. is of the Reception of Hereticks. It ordains, that the *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Novatians*, *Continents*, *Tesseradecatites*, and *Apollinarists*, shall be received after they have made Abjuration in Writing, by anointing their Fore-head, Eyes, Nostrils, Mouth and Ears with the Holy Chrism, pronouncing these Words; *This is the Seal of the Holy Ghost*. That the *Eunomians*, *Montanists* and *Sabellians* shall be re-baptized. That the *Manichees*, *Valentinians*, *Marcionites* and other Hereticks, are also to abjure their Errors, anathematizing all Hereticks by Name, and making profession of the true Faith.

The 96th. is against plating and curling the Hair.

The 97th. forbids Husbands to cohabit with their Wives within the Enclosure of the Church.

The 98th. prohibits marrying a Maid betrothed to another.

The 99th. prohibits offering roast Meats to Priests in Churches.

The 100th. prohibits lascivious Pictures.

The 101st. enjoins, that those that will receive the Eucharist must hold their Hands a-cross, and so receive it. It forbids using Vessels of Gold, or of any other Matter, to receive it in.

The 102^d. shews, to them that are entrusted with Power, to bind or to loose; that they ought to exercise this Ministry with a great deal of Prudence and Wisdom, considering well the Distemper, applying Remedies as skilful Physicians, and examining whether they do truly and sincerely repent.

Of the Councils held in the Eighth Age.

The Assembly of Barkhamstead in the Kingdom of Kent.

Of Barkhamstead.

WIGHTHRED, King of Kent, held an Assembly (*Anno 697.*) which *Birchwald*, Bishop of *Canterbury*, assisted at, and *Gebmond*, Bishop of *Rochester*, with several of the Clergy and Laity, which made some Ecclesiastical and Civil Laws.

The 1st. ordains, that the Church shall be free, and enjoy her Courts of Justice, Revenues, and Pensions, that they shall pray for the Prince, and voluntarily submit to his Orders.

The 2^d. that the Fine, for infringing the Justice of the Church, shall be 50. Pence, as that of the King's Justice is.

The 3^d. ordains, that the Adulterers of the Laity shall be put to Penance, and they of the Clergy shall be deposed.

The 4th. that Foreigners, guilty of that Crime, shall be expelled the Realm.

The 5th. and 6th. that those of the Nobility, overtaken in that Sin, shall be fined in 100. Pence, and the Peasants in 50.

The 7th. permits an Ecclesiastical Person guilty of Adultery, if he break off that habit, to continue in the Priesthood, provided that he have not maliciously refused to administer Baptism, or that he be not a Drunkard.

The 8th. imports, that if one, with the Tonsure, that is, a Monk, do not keep his Rule, he shall retire into an Hospital with Permission.

The 9th. that the Slaves enfranchised before the Altar, shall enjoy their Liberty, and be capable of Succession, and of the other Rights of Free Persons.

The three next Canons punish with pecuniary Mulcts those who set their Slaves to work, or to go a Journey on a Sunday.

The four following appoint Corporal Punishments or Fines against those who sacrifice to Devils.

The 17th. imports, that the Bishops and the King's Word ought to be believed without any Oath.

The 18th. that Abbots shall swear, as Priests do; and that that the Priests shall swear before the Altar,

by saying simply, *I speak the truth in Jesus Christ, and I lie not*; that the Deacons shall take the same Oath.

The 19th. that other Clerks shall take four Persons more with them to clear themselves by Oath, and that they shall lay one of their Hands upon the Altar.

The 20th. that Strangers shall not be obliged to bring other Persons with them.

The 21st. that the Peasants shall present themselves with four Persons more, and shall bow the Head before the Altar.

The 22^d. declares, that the Causes of the Bishops Clients belong to the Ecclesiastical Court.

The 23^d. ordains, that if any Body impeach a Slave, his Master may purge him with his bare Oath, provided he take the Eucharist; but if he taketh it not, he must put in Bail, or submit to the Penalty.

The 24th. that a Clergyman shall purge his Slave with his bare Oath.

The 25th. that he that kills a Robber, is not liable to pay any Sum for that Death.

The 26th. that he that shall be caught carrying something away, shall be punished with Death, Banishment, or Fine, according to the King's Will: that he that got hold on him, shall have half the Fine; but if he kills him, he shall be fined in 70. Pence.

The 27th. that he that helps the Flight of a Slave, who hath robbed his Master, shall be fined in 70. Pence, and he that killeth him shall pay the worth of him.

The 28th. that the Strangers and Vagabonds which run up and down the Country, without blowing the Horn, or crying aloud, shall be used as High-way-men.

These Laws are followed with some Canons concerning the Pecuniary Compensation of the Wrongs done to the Church or the Priesthood. They were found in the same Monument; but it is not known whose they are, nor at what time they were written.

Councils held in England about the matter of Wilfrid.

Of England.

FEW Men have been more molested and cross'd in their Life than *Wilfrid*, Abbot of *Rippon*, and afterwards Bishop of *York*. He was a Native of *Northumberland*, born towards the year 634. He left his own Country to go to *Rome*, where he was instructed in the Discipline of that Church. Thence he returned to *Lyons*, and there he received the Tonsure from *Delphin*, Bishop of that City, who was murder'd soon after by *Ebroin's* Order. After his Death, *Wilfrid* was called home by *Alfrid*, eldest Son of *Osui*, King of *Northumberland*, who gave him the Monastery of *Rippon*, founded by him in the Bishoprick of *York*. He was ordain'd Priest by *Hagilbert*, Bishop of *Dorchester*. He was present at the Conference, held at *Streneshall* before the King, about the Difference between the Church of *Rome*, and the ancient *British* and *Irish* Churches, about *Easter-day*; and there he maintain'd the Usage of the *Roman* Church against *Colman*, an *Irishman*. Afterward, he was nominated to the Archbishoprick of *York*, and passed over into *France* to get himself ordain'd, there being but one Bishop in *England*. He was consecrated by *Angilbert*, Bishop of *Paris*, and eleven Bishops assisted at that Ceremony. During his Absence, they that stood for the Usage of the *Irish*

Churches persuaded King *Osui* to put into the Church of *York*, *Ceadde*, Abbot of *Lislinguen*, who was consecrated by one *English* and two *British* Bishops. *St. Wilfrid*, after his return, did immediately retire into his Monastery, and after that, he was called out into *Mercia*, where the King gave him *Lichfield*, to erect a Bishoprick or a Monastery there. After the Death of *Adeodatus*, Bishop of *Canterbury*, he perform'd for some time the Episcopal Functions in that Church, till *Theodorus* obtained that See. This Man re-established *St. Wilfrid* in the Archbishoprick of *York*, and deprived *Ceadde*, who did very patiently bear that Expulsion. *Wilfrid* enjoy'd that Archbishoprick peaceably, during King *Osui's* Reign; but he was turned out of it in the beginning of *Egfrid's* Reign, towards the year 670. being deposed by *Theodorus* himself. He presently withdrew into *Friesland*, and thence went to *Rome*. He was very well entertain'd by Pope *Agatho*, who restored him to his Dignity in a Council of Bishops, and that Sentence was confirm'd by the Popes *Benedict* and *Sergius*. Being fortified with this Authority, he came back again into *England*, where he met with bad Entertainment, and was imprisoned by the Order of Queen *Ermenburge*, *Egfrid's* Wife. Being got out, he went to preach

Councils held in England. preach the Gospel to the *South-Saxons*, and baptized, as 'tis believed, *Edelwach* [or *Ethelwolfe*] their King. *Theodorus* seeing that he had suffered himself to be surprized by St. *Wilfrid's* Enemies, reconciled himself with him, and prevailed with King *Alfrid* to consent to his Re-establishment: He return'd to *York* in 686. but five years after, he was expelled again, for refusing to receive some Constitutions, made by *Theodorus*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*. He returned to his Bishoprick of *Lichfield*, which he found vacant. Some years after, he was invited by *Brithwald*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, to be present at a Synod, within two Leagues of *Rippon*, in hope of an Agreement. They urged him to withdraw into his Abby of *Rippon*, and to quit his Bishoprick. He did not only refuse to do it, but he had recourse to the Holy See. Therefore he went to *Rome* again, and purged himself before Pope *John* in a Synod, in the presence of the Deputies of both Parties, and was declared innocent. With

this Sentence he returned into *England*, but *Alfrid* would not permit it to be executed. *Sexulfus*, who succeeded him, continued in the same resolution; but being turn'd out, two Months after, and *Ofred* having succeeded him, *Brithwald*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, went into *Northumberland*, and there held a Synod in 705. near the River *Nid*, at which the King also and the Officers, and the great ones of the Country were present. They read the Pope's Letters, and after some difficulties, raised by the Bishops of the Country, they were reconciled, and that long Contest was thus happily ended. *Wilfrid* yielded up his Episcopal See of *York* to *John* of *Beverly*, and he was restored to the Possession of the Church of *Haguestad*, and of the Abby of *Rippon*. He died in 709.

These Matters of Fact are certain, being affirmed by *Eddi*, St. *Wilfrid's* Disciple and Author of his Life, by *John VII's* Letters, and the relation of *Bede* and *William* of *Malmesbury*.

The Council of Rome under Gregory II.

This Council was held in April 721. in St. *Peter's* Church. Twenty two Bishops were present at it, among whom there was one of *Spain*, one of *England*, and another of *Scotland*, eleven Priests and five Deacons. *Gregory II.* presided in it, and published the Constitutions which were approved by all that were present.

The eleven first are against them that marry their Kindred, Persons consecrated to God, or the Wives

of Priests and Deacons, or who steal away Widows and Maidens.

The 12th. is against those that consult Diviners or Sorcerers; or use Enchantments.

The 13th. against those that invade Gardens or Places belonging to the Church.

The 14th, 15th, and 16th. against a * private Man, who had married the Deaconness [*Epiphania*.]

And the 17th. against Clerks wearing long Hair.

Of Rome.

* *Adrianus* the Son of *Exilarsus*.

The Council of Germany under Carloman.

This Council was assembled in *Germany*, *An.* 742. by the order of *Carloman* the French Prince. *Boniface* held the first place there. Both the number of the Bishops, and the place of it *, are unknown. The Canons of this Council are set down in the Capitularies under the name of *Carloman*, who declares, that following the advice of his Bishops, Monks and Lords, he caused Bishops to be ordain'd in his Towns, and subjected them to the Archbishop *Boniface*, the Legate of the Holy See; that he hath ordered a Synod to be kept every year in his Presence, to re-establish the Churches Rights, and to reform Manners and Discipline; that he hath caused Church-lands, that had been invaded, to be restored; hath deprived wicked Priests, Deacons and Clerks, guilty of Fornication, of the Ecclesiastical Revenues, degraded them and put them to Penance. This is the Sum of the first Canon.

The 2d. imports, that he hath forbidden Clerks to bear Arms, or to go to the Army, except those that have been chosen to celebrate Divine Service there, and to carry the Relicks of Saints, that is, one or two Bishops, with two Chaplains, and two Priests for the Prince; and for the Lords one Priest only, to hear Confessions and impose Penances. He forbids the Chair or Pulpit to the Clerks.

By the 3d. Canon he enjoins Parsons to be subject to their Bishop, to give him an account once a

year in *Lent* of their Ministry, to receive him when he is Visiting, to go every year to fetch new Chrism on *Holy-Thursday* before *Easter*; that the Bishop may be a Witness of the Chastity, Life, Faith and Doctrine of his Presbyters.

The 4th. prohibits admitting into the Presbyterial or Episcopal Functions, unknown Priests or Bishops, before they be examined in a Synod.

The 5th. orders Bishops, with the help of the Magistrates, to purge their Dioceses from *Pagan* Superstitions.

The 6th. ordains, that he or she that shall henceforward fall into the Crime of Fornication shall be imprison'd, and shall do Penance there with Bread and Water; and if he be a Priest that hath committed this Crime, he shall be shut up for two years, having been whipt till the Blood comes; and then the Bishop shall lay on him what Penance he pleases. And if it be a simple Clerk or Monk, he shall be whipt three times, and then shut up for one year; that the Nuns which have received the Veil, shall be used after the same manner and shaved.

The 7th. forbids Presbyters and Deacons to wear close Coats, as Laicks do; and ordains, that they shall use long Cassocks. It forbids them to have Women in their Houses with them. It enjoins Monks and Nuns exactly to follow St. *Benedict's* Rule.

The Council of Lestines.

AN. 743. the same *Carloman* assembled a Council at *Lestines*, near *Cambray*, the Canons whereof do immediately follow the last mention'd, in the Book of the Capitularies. They go also under *Carloman's* name, declaring, that in the Assembly then held at *Lestines*, the Bishops, Nobles and Governors of Provinces have confirm'd the foregoing Decrees of the Assembly, promising to observe them, to receive the Canons of the Fathers, and to re-establish the Church-discipline and Doctrine in its Splendor. That the Abbots and Monks have received St. *Benedict's* Rule, and promised to keep it.

That they have degraded and put to Penance such Priests as are guilty of Adultery or Fornication, and ordained, that the Decree made against them shall be executed.

In the 2d. he ordains, by the advice of his Clergy and People, that the Laity shall enjoy the Church-lands, which they hold as Tenants at will, upon condition that they shall pay a Penny for every House, and when he that enjoys them, comes to die, they shall return to the Church; yet so, that if it be needful still for the good of the State, or if the Prince orders it so, they shall renew their Leases; provided,

Council of Lestines. ed, nevertheless, that the Churches or Monasteries, whose Lands are held by such a Title, are not extreme poor.

In the 3d. Canon, Adulteries, Incests and illegitimate Marriages are prohibited. Bishops are ordered to hinder and punish them. It forbids also delivering Christian Slaves to Pagans.

In the 4th. *Carloman* renews his Father's Decree

against them that observe *Pagan* Superstitions, condemning them to a 15 Pence Fine.

These Canons in an ancient Collection are joined with an Abjuration in the *Tudesk* Tongue, a List of the most ordinary Superstitions, and an Instruction about prohibited Marriages, and about the prohibition of keeping the Sabbath-day. This hath so much relation to the Canons of this Council, that it may be rationally believed to have been part of it.

The Council of Rome held under Pope Zachary.

Cy. Rome. THIS Council was held (*An.* 743.) and composed of 40 *Italian* Bishops or thereabouts, and of many Priests. *Zachary* published there the following Canons, which were written and approved by those that assisted at it.

The 1st. decrees, that Bishops shall not dwell with Women.

The 2d. that Presbyters and Deacons shall have no strange Women in the House with them, tho' they may have their Mother and near Relations.

The 3d. that Priests and Deacons shall be decently clad, and shall wear a Cloak in the Town.

The 4th. that the Bishops ordain'd by the Holy See shall every year in the Ides of *May* come to the Council, if they be near; if not, they shall perform this duty by writing Letters.

The 5th. anathematizeth those that marry a Priest's or a Deacon's Wife, a Nun, or a Religious Woman, as also those who marry their God-mother.

The 6th. forbids any Person to marry his Cousin-german, Niece, Mother-in-law, Sister-in-law, and any near Relations.

The 7th. anathematizeth those who steal Maidens and Widows [to marry them.]

The 8th. is against those [Clerks or Monks] that let their Hair grow.

The 9th. prohibits Feasting on *New-year's-day*, as the Heathens did.

The 10th. anathematizes those who give their Daughters in Marriage to the *Jews*, or sell Christian Slaves to them.

The 11th. ordains, that the times appointed by the Canons for Ordinations shall be observed; that Persons twice married shall not be ordained; that no Clerk of another Diocese shall be ordained or received without a Dimissory Letter, or permission from his Bishop.

The 12th. Canon ordains, that if Priests, Deacons or other Clerks, have any difference among themselves, they shall apply themselves to the Bishop only to be judged; and if they differ with their own Bishop, they shall go to the next Bishop; and if they will not refer the matter to him, they shall go to the Holy See.

The 13th. forbids Bishops, Priests and Deacons, to carry a Staff to the celebrating of the Mass, or to step up to the Altar with the Head uncovered.

The Council of Soissons.

Of Soissons. THIS Council was assembled by *Pepin* Prince and Duke of *France*, the 2d. year of *Chilperick's* Reign, *An.* 744. *March* 2d. It was composed of 28 Bishops, of some Priests and Lords. *Adalbert* was condemned there. After this Council, *Pepin* published 10 Canons in his own and this Assembly's name.

By the 1st. they own the Faith established in the *Nicene* Council, and the Authority of the Canons of other Councils; and they publish them in *France* that the Discipline, which was corrupted there, may be re-established.

It is ordain'd in the 2d. that there shall be a Synod kept every year, to procure the Salvation of the People and to prevent Heresies, such as that of * *Adalbert* was, who was condemned by 23 Bishops and several Priests, with the Prince's and the People's consent.

[* *Adalbert's* Heresy was that he taught, that it was lawful to marry the Elder Brother's Wife, according to the Custom of the *Jews*, and that Jesus Christ, when he went down into Hell, did release as well the Wicked as Godly. And for these Doctrines he was condemned in this Council. *Vide Bon. Ep. ad Zach. in Us. Ep. Hib. Syl.*]

In the 3d. he declares, that by the advice of the Bishops and great ones, he hath put legitimate Bishops in the Towns of *France*, and hath given them for Archbishops over them, *Abel* and *Ardorbert* (the former was Archbishop of *Rheims* and the latter of

Sens) to have recourse to their Judgments, when it shall be needful both for the Bishops and the People, to the end that the Monasteries may be regular and orderly, that Monks and Nuns may peaceably enjoy their Revenues, and the Clerks be not debauched, not wearing secular Habits nor going a Hunting.

By the 4th. He forbids the Laity to commit Fornication, Perjury and bear false Witness. He enjoins Parish-priests to be subject to their Bishop, to give him yearly, in *Lent*, an account of their management; to demand the Holy Oil and the Chrism of him, and to receive him when he is upon his visit. The 5th. forbids receiving foreign Clerks and Priests, before they be approved by the Bishop of the Diocese. The 6th. charges Bishops to endeavour the utter extirpation of *Paganism*. The 7th. orders the Crosses set up by *Adalbert*, in his Diocese, to be burnt. The 8th. forbids Clerks to have Women in their Houses, except their Mother, Sister or Niece. The 9th. forbids the Laity to have in their Houses Women devoted to God, and also to marry another Man's Wife during the Life of her Husband; because Husbands ought not to forsake their Wives, but in case they have caught them in Adultery. The last ordains, that whoever shall violate these Laws, made by 23 Bishops, Servants of God, with the consent of the Princes and the Grandees of *France*, shall be judged by the Prince, or by the Bishops, or by the Counts.

The second Council of Rome under Zachary.

Of Rome. THIS Council (assembled *An.* 745.) was composed of 7 Bishops and some Presbyters. The Presbyter *Deneardus*, sent by *Boniface*, came before the Council (*Octob.* 25.) and declared, that this Bishop had called a Synod in *France*, in which *Clement* and *Adalbert*, false, schismatical and heretical Bishops, had been deposed, and then put in Prison

by the Prince's order; but, that they would not obey this Sentence, keeping their Dignity still, and continuing to seduce the People. He added, he had * a Letter of *Boniface's* upon this Subject: it was read, he demanded, that those two Bishops should be kept in Prison, and that no Body might speak with them. He accuses *Adalbert*, who was a *French*

[* This Letter is extant in *Ussher's Bp. Hib. Syl. Man log. p. 31.*]

Council second of Rome. Man, to have been an Hypocrite in his Youth, to have made People believe, that an Angel from Heaven had brought him some Relicks from far, by which means he could obtain whatever he desired of God; that afterward he had given Money to be ordain'd by some ignorant Bishops; that at last he equall'd himself to the Apostles; that he would consecrate no more Churches to the honour of the Apostles or Martyrs; that he condemned Pilgrimages to Rome to visit the Sepulchres of the Apostles; that he had consecrated Altars in his own Name; that he had set up little Crosses and small Chappels in the Country, where he kept Assemblies; that the People crowded thither and forsook the Churches; that some had been so impudent as to say, St. *Adalbert's* Merits shall help us; and that he had the Face to give some of his own Nails and Hair to be honoured and carried with St. *Peter's* Relicks; that the People flocking to him, to cast themselves down at his Feet, ready to confess their Sins, he told them, there was no need for them to do it, that he knew all they had done, that their Sins were forgiven them, and that they might be assured of it.

As for *Clement*, who came out of *Ireland*, that he did reject the authority of the Canons; that he would not receive the Writings of the Fathers, and maintain'd he might continue Bishop, after having had two Bastards; that he gave leave to marry the Brother's Wife; that he affirmed, that Christ, being descended into Hell, had delivered all those that were there, whether Believers or Unbelievers, *Jews* or *Pagans*, Worshippers of the true God or Idolaters.

Council second of Rome. These Accusations, brought to the Synod of *Rome*, provoked the indignation of the Bishops against those two wicked Villains: yet the Pope put off the judging of this Matter to another Meeting on the same day. They read in this the Proofs of the Facts alledg'd in *Boniface's* Letter; the Life of this *Adalbert*, a Letter which he affirmed to have fall'n from Heaven, and to be found by St. *Michael*, and brought to *Rome* by another Angel. These Follies became a Laughing-matter to the Council.

The next day they read a Prayer of *Adalbert's* making, wherein he called upon the Angels *Uriel*, *Raguel*, *Tubiel*, *Michael*, *Incâr*, *Tubicâs*, *Sabaoc*, *Simiel*. The Council, hearing all this, declared, that all these pretended Angels, except St. *Michael*, were Demons; that they knew the names but of three Angels, *Michael*, *Raphael* and *Gabriel*. They required *Adalbert's* Writings to be burnt; but the Pope judg'd it better, to secure them in the Library of the *Roman* Church. After this, the Council declared, that *Adalbert*, whose Acts had now been read, who made himself be called Apostle, and his Nails and Hair be honoured as Relicks, who had seduced the People into several Errors, and invoked Demons for Angels, ought to be deposed and put to Penance. They pronounced the same Sentence against *Clement*, upon the Accusations brought in *Boniface's* Letter.

This is the sum of the Acts of this Council, in the end of which is the Letter of *Geminulus* Deacon of the *Roman* Church to *Boniface*, about the condemnation of those two false Bishops.

The Council of Cloveshaw.

Council of Cloveshaw. THIS Council was held in *England* at *Cloveshaw*, *Septemb. 1st. 747*. Altho' it was composed but of 12 Bishops, it may pass for a National Synod of *England*, because, besides the Archbishop of *Canterbury* and the Bishop of *Rocheſter*, there were the Bishops of the *Mercians*, *Saxons*, both *East* and *West Angles*, and some other People of *England* present at it. They read a Letter, which *Zachary* wrote to the Church of *England*, to exhort them to restore the Discipline. After which, they made 30 Canons. In the 1st. the Bishops are exhorted to do their Duty, to discharge their Ministry with Zeal and Vigilance, to give themselves wholly to it, and to entangle themselves no more in secular Affairs, but apply themselves to the Service of God and the Church, to instruct their People, and to set them a good Example, by leading an exemplary Life. The 2^d. recommends Peace and Union to them. The 3^d. prescribes them to visit their Dioceses every year, and to abolish the remainder of Heathenish Superstitions. The 4th. to warn Abbots and Abbesses to live regularly, to be Examples to the Monks and Nuns under their Government, and to take care of them. The 5th. enjoins them not wholly to neglect the Monasteries held by Seculars, to visit those that dwell therein, and to put a Presbyter in them. The 6th. forbids them ordaining Presbyters, before they be assured of their unblameable Life. The 7th. ordains, that there shall be Lectures in the Abbies both for Men and Women, and that they take care to instruct the Youth therein. The 8th. enjoins Presbyters to leave their Secular Businesses, to apply themselves wholly to the Service of the Church, to read Divine Service with attention; to look to the Church and the Ornaments of it; to addict themselves to Reading, Praying, Celebrating the Divine Office; to admonish and reprove those under their Tuition, and to draw them to God by their Words and Example. The 9th. enjoins them to administer the Sacraments, and to live without scandal. The 10th. imports, that they shall know how to perform their Functions, and shall be able to explain the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Prayers of the Mass and of Baptism; that they shall also take care to learn the signification of those Ceremonies and Sacraments. The

Of Cloveshaw. 11th. that they shall all administer Baptism in the same manner, and shall explain the Ceremonies and the Effects of this Sacrament. The 12th. that the Priests shall not read the Prayers aloud, but shall sing them with a sweet and agreeable Melody; and if they cannot do this, they shall only pronounce them distinctly. The 13th. that in Festivals they shall follow the *Roman* Rites. The 14th. that the Abbots and Parsons shall not fail to read Divine Service in their Churches every Sunday and Holy-day. The 15th. commands them to sing the seven Canonical Hours of the day and the night, and forbids intermixing unusual Prayers, which are neither out of the Scripture, nor according to the *Roman* Usage. The 16th. appoints, that Rogations or Litanies shall be made by the Clergy and People, on the usual days, namely, on the 26th. of *November*, and three days before the Ascension, on which they shall fast till the ninth Hour of Prayer and say Mass. It prohibits mixing prophane Songs with this Ceremony, and will have nothing to be carried in (a) Procession but only the Cross and some Relicks.

[(a) Procession.] This piece of Devotion, which for the time was both seasonable and solemn, when it was first instituted by *Claudius Mamertus* in a time of a general Earthquake at *Vienna*, wherein all the People walking two by two through the Streets and Fields of the City, did sing Litanies imploring God's Mercy in averting that Judgment; being found a successful means to obtain the Blessing desired, was ever after continued in the Church, and in this Age, with other things, degenerated into a pompous Ceremony and a ludicrous Worship, the Christians carrying before them Crosses, Relicks, yea, and the Sacrament it self after the manner of the *Persians*. This Canon sets limits to the growth of this Superstition, allowing only Crosses and Relicks to be carried in Procession. But that which might give a greater Check to it is this, that some of the most Learned that use it, have much suspected the Goodness of this sort of Worship, and whether it is pleasing to God or no; for thus one of them speaks: *Haud scio, an tam recte quam belle id fiat; Vereor inquam, vereor, ne iis in rebus Diis potius gratium quam Christo gratiam faciamus*. I am doubtful, whether in this Ceremony there be not more Pomp than Goodness; for I am afraid, that in these Matters we do more Service to the False Gods than the true.

The 17th. ordains, that they shall keep the Festivals of St. *Gregory* the Pope, and St. *Austine* the Apostle of the *English*. The 18th. that the Fasts of the Ember-weeks shall be kept. The 19th. enjoins Monks

Council of Clove-shaw. submission to their Superior, and forbids them to wear secular Habits. The 20th. warns the Bishops to see that Monasteries be, according to their Name, the abode of Folks living in silence, peace and repose, and working for God, praising and praying to him, and giving themselves to spiritual Reading; and not places of retreat for Poets, Musicians and Buffoons. It forbids admitting Laymen into them, particularly into the Convents of Virgins. It enjoins these to set themselves to reading or singing, rather than to embroidering of Stuffs of divers colours to make secular Habits. The 21st. ordains, that the Meals of Friars and Nuns shall be sober and modest, and shall not begin, if possible, till the third hour of Prayer be over, that is, till noon. The 22d. enjoins Monks and Ecclesiasticks to make themselves worthy Communicants of Christ's Body and Blood, and reproves those that neglect this Duty to live licentiously, without any care of confessing their Sins. The 23d. orders, that they shall bring Lay-children, not yet corrupted by youthful Lusts, to communicate frequently; and that aged Persons also, ceasing from Sin, shall be exhorted to frequent communicating. The 24th. enjoins a serious trying of those who come to make a religious Profession, and that they shall not give them the Habit till they have been well proved. The 25th. that the Bishops shall publish, in their Dioceses, the Canons of the Synod, and if there be any abuses in their Dioceses, which they cannot remedy, they shall acquaint the Synod with them. The 26th. recommends Almsgiving, but will not have Men give ill-gotten Goods, or with an intent to sin more freely, or to lessen the satisfaction of the canonical Penance, or to free themselves from Fasting, &c. The 27th. teaches how to pray; there it is said, that tho' they do not understand the *Latin* of the *Psalms* they sing, yet they may refer their intention to the general Petitions, which are to be made to God (b).

[(b) Publick Service performed in Latin in Eng'and, tho' not understood.] Altho' 'tis very probable, that in some places of England the *Latin-tongue* was

(This shews, that the publick Service was then performed in *Latin* in *England*, altho' some did then pray in the *Saxon-tongue*

privately, as it is observed in this place). In the end, it condemns an Abuse which began to grow common, of those who dispensed with themselves in Fasting and Praying, getting others to do it for them for Money, and thinking, by this means, to satisfy their Duty and the Penance laid upon them.

the Country; especially, if it be true that some Historians relate that the Saxons, when *Austine* the Monk came into *England*, had no Letters. So that this is no Argument for the *Romish* Imposition of the *Latin* Service upon Nations, where that Tongue is not understood; a thing so highly unreasonable in it self, so opposite to H. Scripture and so contrary to the Primitive Practice as the Fathers do unanimously agree, that for the space of 800 years after Christ we can find no Nation, but what had their Liturgy and Scriptures either in their own Tongue or in a Language well understood by them, by the reading and hearing of which they might be edified, and in which they might join with Heart and Voice. Indeed the *Latin-tongue* was generally received in *Europe* and *Africa*, and most of the Christian Churches in the *Roman* Empire, but then it was as generally understood; the *Romans* labouring to have all the Provinces of the Empire to speak *Latin*. And when through the Incursions of the *Goths* and *Vandals*, and other barbarous Nations, the *Latin-tongue* was not only corrupted but lost, then Translations became necessary, tho' the Church continued the publick Service in the same Language; for 'tis not sufficient, as this Council says, to refer their Intention to the general Petitions, but they must hear and pray with the Spirit and Understanding also; and the most ignorant and illiterate ought to be able to say *Amen* to the Priests Prayers and Thanksgiving, as the Apostle reproves, 1 Cor. 14. 16.

The 28th. forbids establishing Communities or Religious Societies without sufficient means to maintain them. It forbids Religious Men and Women to wear secular and prophane Habits. The 29th. forbids Religious Men and Women to dwell in private Houses, and enjoins them to receive those that shall betake themselves to them. The 30th. orders Prayers to be made in Churches at all hours for Kings and Princes.

The Council of Verberie.

of Verberie. THIS Council, or Assembly rather, was held in the beginning of *Pepin's* Reign An. 752. at *Verberie* in the Diocese of *Soissons*: they made twenty Chapters which were published by the Authority of *Pepin*.

The first ordains that those that marry in the third Degree of consanguinity shall be put asunder, and that after having done Penance they may marry others. That those in the fourth Degree only shall not be separated, but only be put to do Penance if they be Married; or otherwise not suffered to marry.

The 2d. declares, that if any Man had any commerce with his Daughter-in-Law, he shall dwell no longer, neither with the Mother nor with the Daughter, and neither the Daughter nor he shall marry others, but the Mother may marry another.

The 3d. imports, that if a Presbyter marry his Niece, he shall be obliged to leave her, and loose his degree; and if any body else marry her, he shall be oblig'd to leave her, but shall have Liberty to marry another.

The 4th. that a Maid, in what manner soever she hath taken the Veil, shall be obliged to keep it, unless it was given her against her Will; and in that case, the Priest that veil'd her, shall be deposed. If a Woman takes the Veil without her Husband's consent, it shall be free for her Husband, to let her keep it, or to hinder her.

The 5th. gives leave to the Husband, whose Wife conspired his death, to send her away, and to marry another.

The 6th. gives leave to those who have married Slaves, whom they thought to be Free-born Women, to marry others.

The 7th. permits Slaves, who have a Concubine, to leave her, to marry their Master's Maid-servant, tho' they do better, if they keep the first.

The 8th. permits the Master to oblige his Slave to marry his Maid-servant, if he hath had any Carnal Knowledge of her.

The 9th. imports, that if Men be forced to go away from the place of their Habitation, and their Wives refuse to follow them without any other Reason, but their Love to their own Country, it shall be free for those Men, whose Wives have thus left them, to marry others; but not for the Wives to marry again.

The 10th. forbids him to marry, who hath layn with his Mother-in-Law, and the Mother-in-Law likewise; and permits the Father-in-Law to marry another Woman.

The 11th. inflicts the same punishment upon them who defiled their Daughter-in-Law, or Sister-in-Law.

The 12th. ordains, that he that lies with two Sisters, shall have neither, tho' the one of them were his Wife.

By the 13th. He that marrieth a Bond Woman, knowing her to be such, is bound to keep her.

The 14th. forbids ambulatory Bishops to ordain any Priests; and if any be found to have been thus ordain'd, and they deserve it, they shall be consecrated anew.

The 15th. that a Priest degraded may baptize in case of necessity.

The 16th. forbids Clerks to bear Arms.

The

Council of Verberie. The 17th. permits a Woman, which complains that her Husband never did cohabit with her, to try the Proof of the Cross; and if it appears by this Tryal, that the thing is so, then she may do what she pleaserth.

The 19th. ordains, that Bond Slaves be exhorted not to marry again, if they be found to be sold severally.

The 20th. imports, that the Slave who is set at

Liberty, may put away his Wife, being a Bond Woman, and marry another.

The 21st. forbids him, who suffered his Wife to be defiled, to marry another.

Regino recites some Articles more about the said Matters, which he ascribes to this Council of *Verberie*. They may be seen in the Edition of the Capitularies of *M. Baluz.* 19. 166. Vol. 1.

The Council of Verneville.

of Verneville This Council was held at *Verneville* upon *Oise*, and not at *Vernon*, as some have thought; about *July* (*An. 755*) by the Order of *Pepin*, who confirm'd by his Edict, and published the Canons that had been proposed in this Council.

The 1st. imports, that there shall be a Bishop in every great City.

The 2d. that Obedience shall be paid to the Bishops made Metropolitans.

The 3d. that the Bishop shall be empower'd to correct the Regulars and Seculars in his Diocess.

The 4th. that there shall be two Synods yearly kept in *France*, one in *March*, the other in *October*.

The 5th. that the Monasteries of Men and Women shall be regular; otherwise, the Bishop shall see to it; and if he cannot do it himself alone, he shall acquaint the Metropolitan with it; if the Metropolitan cannot yet correct and order it, he shall inform the Synod of it; and if they slight the Synod, they shall be excommunicated.

The 6th. that an Abbess shall have but one Monastery to govern; that neither she, nor any of her Religious Women shall go out without Permission from the King, that they shall send secular Persons to the Prince or Synod, to represent their Grievances; that those, that are not veiled, shall be put out of the Community, and if they be willing to live regularly, they shall be admitted after Tryal.

The 7th. that no Baptistry shall be erected without the Bishop's Leave.

The 8th. that the Priests shall be subject to the Bishops, and that they shall neither baptize, nor celebrate the Office without Permission from him.

The 9th. that they that communicate with excommunicated Persons shall be excommunicated; that excommunicated Persons shall not enter into the Church; that they shall not eat with any of the Faithful; that no body may receive Gifts from them; nor kiss nor salute them.

The 10th. that Monks shall not go to *Rome*, nor out of their Monasteries, unless the Bishop gives them Leave to go into a more strict Monastery.

The 11th. imports, that all Clerks shall live, as Canons, under the Bishop's Care; or as Monks, under an Abbot.

Council of Verneville The 12th. that Clerks do not change the Church, and that Clerks of another Church shall not be received.

The 13th. forbids Bishops to ordain or perform any other Episcopal Function out of their Diocess, without the Bishop's Order [of the Diocess].

The 14th. permits necessary Works, such as dressing of Meat, or making the House clean on Sunday; but forbids the Works of Agriculture.

The 15th. enjoins both the Nobles and the Common People to be married publicly.

The 16th. renews the third Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which forbids Clerks to meddle with secular Affairs.

The 17th. is the 25th. of the Council of *Chalcedon*, about the Vacancy of Bishopricks.

The 18th. renews the Ordinance of the 9th. ch. of the 3d. Council of *Carthage*, which forbids Clerks to come before the Tribunals of the Laity, without the Bishop's Leave.

The 19th. is concerning the Immunities of Churches.

The 20th. ordains, that the Accounts of Monasteries Lands and Revenues, if they be Royal, shall be given to the King; if Episcopal, to the Bishop; this Canon was made in another Synod, and perhaps the following Canons also.

The 21st. that the Bishop shall have the Cures of his Diocess.

The 22d. that no Right shall be exacted from Pilgrims.

The 23d. that Counts and Judges shall hear the Causes of Churches, Widows and Orphans preferably to others.

The 24th. that no Money shall be given, to get into Holy Orders.

The 25th. that Bishops, Abbots, and others shall take no Presents to administer Justice.

The 26th. is concerning the Rights of Portage.

The 27th. the Weight of Money.

The 28th. Exemptions.

The 29th. Secular Courts of Justice.

The 30th. forbids Ecclesiastical Persons to go to Law, with their Superior, without Permission.

The Council of Metz.

of Metz. This is another Synodical Assembly, held under *Pepin* after the former, *An. 756*. the Laws whereof were authorized and promulged by *Pepin*.

The first is against the Incests, committed either with a Person consecrated to God, a She-Gossip, a Godmother, whether at Baptism, or Confirmation with two Sisters, with a Niece, a Cousin-German, or Aunt, &c. they are deeply fined.

The 2d. appoints the Deposition of the Superior

Clergy, convicted of these Crimes, and the Inferior are condemned to Whipping, or Imprisonment.

The 3d. ordains, that the Archdeacon shall bring the Priests to the Bishop's Synod.

The 4th. renews the Ordinance of the Council of *Verneville*, that they that hold Benefices of the King, shall give an account to him.

The 5th. imports, that those that hold Churches in a Diocess, shall pay the Rights, and the Wax due to the Mother Church.

The four last are in the Council of *Verneville*.

The Council of Compeigne.

of Compeigne. *Pepin's* last Capitulary is that which he made at *Compeigne* in 757. It contains 21. Canons, which are almost nothing else but a Repetition of the Canons of the preceding Capitularies: So that it is needless now to set down the Particu-

lars of it. We shall not speak neither of the Assemblies of the same Nature, held under *Charles the Great*, seeing we have related the Canons of them in the Abstract of his Capitularies.

The second Council of Nice for Images. The seventh General. Wherein the Acts of another Assembly, held at Constantinople, An. 754. against Images, are related: And the Books written in France against these two Councils: Together with the Letters of the Popes upon that Subject.

Of Nice. (a) **T**HE Use and Worship of Images was commonly received in the *East*, when the Emperor *Leo*, surnamed *Isaurus*, [or the *Isaurian*] being advanced to the Empire (*An. 717.*) undertook to abolish this Practice. The Contest began about the year 725. He found in his way Pope *Gregory II.* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and *St. John Damascene*. The first of these wrote vehemently to him upon this Subject. In his first Letter, he represents to him, that having received in former years several of his Letters, very Orthodox, he wondered, that ten years after, he went about to destroy Images, and treat them as Idolaters, who honoured them. He maintains, that the *Word*, having rendered himself visible, by taking the Humane Body, they might draw Christ's Picture. Yea, and he pretends, that the first *Christians* had some Pictures of him, and of *St. James*, *St. Stephen*, and the other first Martyrs. He alledges the Picture which Christ sent to King *Agbarus*. He confesses that no Image can be made of the Deity. He adds, Images are very useful to stir up Motions of Piety and Compunction in the Faithful. He says, they don't worship Cloths, and Stones, but they are a Means of renewing the Memory of Saints, and raising our Mind to God. He denies also that they are worshipped as Deities; but he says, that, if they be Images of Christ, they (b) say before them, *Lord Jesus, save us*: And if they be Images of the Virgin, they say, *Holy Mother of God, intercede for us with thy Son, that he may save our Souls*: If it be a Martyr, *Intercede for us*, &c. He complains, that he did not follow the Counsels of *German*, who was then 95. years old, but those of *Apollinaris*, and other like Persons. He tells him, that it belongs to Bishops, and not to Emperors, to judge of Ecclesiastical Doctrines; that as Bishops do not meddle with Secular Affairs, so the Emperors should not meddle with the Ecclesiastical. He observed, that it was to no purpose to assemble the General Council he had required; if he would only give over prosecuting Images, the Church would be at quiet. He protests, that (c) he was so far from raising Tumults against him, that he hath written to all the Princes of the *West* in his Behalf, and that they were resolved to live peaceably with him; but, that hearing he was the Destroyer of Images, and had sent an Officer to break an Image of our Saviour, which was done before several Persons of the *West*, they had laid aside

all Respect of him, had broken down his Statues, and the *Barbarians* had invaded *Decapolis*, had put out the Magistrates, and taken the City of *Ravenna*; that his Imprudence had been the Occasion of all this.

Then he relates the Emperor's Threatnings to him in these Terms: 'I will send to *Rome*, says he, to break down *St. Peter's* Image, and will carry *Gregory* away, as *Constans* did formerly *Martin*. He answers him thus: 'You ought to know, and be sure, that the *Roman* Bishops do always imploy themselves to maintain the Peace between the *East* and the *West*; our Predecessors endeavoured to do it, and we do follow their Example. But if you go on to insult over us, we will not fight against you, but will withdraw within 24 Furlongs from *Rome*, into *Campania*; after that, do what you please.' Then he puts him in Mind, that *Constans*, who persecuted Pope *Martin*, died unfortunately in his Sin, being slain in the Temple by one of his Officers, being informed by the Bishops of *Sicily*, that he was an Heretick: that *Martin*, contrariwise, was honoured as a Saint in the Place of his Banishment in *Thrace*, and the Northern Countries. That he desires nothing more, than to tread in the Steps of his Predecessors; but, that he thought himself bound to preserve his own Life for the People's Good; because in all the *West*, every body's Eyes were upon him, and all Christians had confidence in him and *St. Peter*, whose Image *Leo* threatened to destroy; that they looked upon *St. Peter* as a God upon Earth; and if *Leo* attempted any thing in the *West*, he feared that they would also avenge those of the *East* mis-used by him: that he knew his Empire did not reach far in *Italy*; that *Rome* only had cause to fear, by reason that the Sea was so near; but if the Pope removed but 24 Furlongs, he was safe. He wonders lastly, that when all the most barbarous People of the *West* grew mild, the Emperor of the *East* should grow fierce and barbarous. He declares to him, that if he sends Men to break down *St. Peter's* Image, the Blood that will be spilt, shall fall upon his Head: As for himself, he protests he is clear and pure from it. This Letter shews the Falshood of what some Greek Historiographers, out of Hatred to the Pope, have reported, that *Gregory II.* had forbidden the *Romans* and *Italians* to pay the Tributes due to *Leo* the Emperor, and had freed them from their Oath of Allegiance to this Prince.

* (a) The Use and Worship of Images were commonly received in the *East*.] Before the Contest about Image-Worship began in the *East*, it cannot be denied, but that Images had been for some time allow'd in Churches, as Helps of the Memory, In-

Greg. Nyss. O-
rat. in Theod.
Martyr.

structors of the Illiterate in Sacred History, and Ornaments of the Church. *Gregory Nyssen* speaks of the Lively Pictures of the Martyrs, and their Sufferings, then painted upon the Walls of Churches, who being the first of all the *Greeks* that mention them, Writers do unanimously agree, that Pictures and Images were about his time [*viz.* about the year 370.] admitted into the Eastern Churches, and that only for Ornament, or History sake. Some indeed did zealously oppose themselves against this Innovation (of whom *Epiphanius* was the Chief) not as a thing absolutely unlawful, but as fearing it might introduce Idolatry among the People. But because it was declared, that no Worship was intended or allowed them; they submitted. But notwithstanding, what these Men foresaw, did, in process of time, come to pass: For not only the People became downright Idolaters, but even the most Learned paid too great a Reverence to them, saying Prayers before them, and worshipping Christ by his Image. This grand Abuse of them stirred up the Emperor *Leo* to remove Images out of Churches, and to destroy and burn them, as the Cause of so great a Sin. This is evident from *Damascene's* Words, who himself was one of

the most violent Opposers of the Emperor's Proceedings. *Exprobrant nobis*, says he, *quod adoramus, & veneramus Christi Mariæ, & Reliquorum Sanctorum Imagines*. They accuse us of Image-worship and Idolatry. And 'twas for this Crime that they appeared so vigorously against Images. They had been used, but when they were abused to the Dishonour of God, *Leo* would endure them no longer in the Church. As soon as they were worshipped, they were pulled down.

(b) If they be Images of Christ, they say before them, *Lord Jesus, save us*, &c.] What plainer Evidences of an Idolatrous Worship than this; not only to bow themselves before the Images, but to pray unto them; just Grounds for *Leo* to charge those Men with Idolatry, that did it, and to be moved like another *Hezekiah*, or *Josiah*, against such horrible Corruptions of God's Worship.

(c) He protests, that he was so far from raising Tumults.] Notwithstanding these Protestations of this Pope, yet the Historians of those times assure us, that he caused several of the Countries, belonging to the Empire, as *Hesperia*, *Cemilia*, *Liguria*, and all his Western Dominions to revolt from him, and forbad them to pay him his Tributes; yea, offered to betray the City of *Rome* it self to the growing Power of the *French*. So wilful and resolute were the *Roman* Patriarchs in maintaining their Superstitions and Idolatry.

2d. Nicene Council.

2d. Nicene Council.

This Letter did not alter *Leo the Isaurian's* Mind; nay, he wrote to the Pope, that he was Emperor and chief Bishop, *Imperator sum & Sacerdos*. *Gregory* writing again to him, in his second Letter, tells him, 'Tis true, the Emperors, his Predecessors, shewed themselves both Emperors and chief Bishops by their Deeds, defending Religion jointly with the Bishops, but he could not pretend to this Dignity, seeing he divested the Church of its Ornaments, and spoiled Temples of Images, which did equally instruct and edifie the People: that Emperors ought not to meddle with Doctrines; that Bishops only had the Understanding necessary to decide them; that Ecclesiastical and Civil Matters being judged by quite different Principles, he might be very skilful in Civil Matters, and have very little Skill in Matters Ecclesiastical; that as Bishops had no Right to meddle with State Affairs, so the Emperor had no Right to govern Church Affairs, to make Elections in the Clergy, to consecrate, to administer the Sacraments; no, nor to receive them, but from the Bishops Hands. That the Prince does punish the Guilty with Death, Banishment, and other Penalties; but the Bishops don't do so; but when any body hath sinned, and confessed his Sin, instead of Beheading, or Hanging of him, they lay on his Head the Gospel or the Cross, they put him in the Vestry, or among the Catechumens, they make him fast, watch and pray; so that after a long Correction and Affliction, they at last give him the Body and Blood of Christ; and having purify'd him, and made him a Vessel of Election, they lead him to Heaven. Then he does sharply rebuke him for his Cruelty, Barbarity and Tyranny, and exhorts him to submit himself. And as to that which was objected, (d) that in the six first Councils, nothing had been said of Images, he answers, that they were so common, that there was no need to speak of them. He advises him to refer himself to his Judgment, and *German's*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, seeing they have received from Christ, the Power of binding and loosing in Heaven, and on Earth. All this did not hinder *Leo the Emperor* from going on in his Enterprize, and from setting out, Jan. 7. An. 730. an Edict, whereby he ordered Images to be removed out of Churches, and sacred Places, and to be thrown into the Fire, inflicting Penalties upon those that would not obey this Order. *German* was then turn'd out, and *Anastasius* put in his Room, in the See of *Constantinople*.

Constantine Copronymus, *Leo's* Son, followed his Father's Steps, and for the better establishing the Discipline, he had a mind to introduce, he called a Council (An. 754.) at *Constantinople*, composed of 338. Bishops. It began in February, and ended in August. This Council made a Decree against the Use and Worship of Images, which we will set down afterwards. It was not received by the *Romans*. But by the Authority of the Emperor, a great part of the *Eastern Churches* received and executed it; till (e) *Irene*, who had married *Leo the Fourth*, Brother to *Constantine Copronymus*, being a Widow, and Mistress of the Empire, her Son *Constantine* being but young, yet was so devout, as to set them up again. To succeed in her Enterprize, she resolved to call a

(d) Obj. That in the six first General Councils, nothing had been said of Images.] A very weighty Objection, and not to be slid over with such an Answer as the Pope gives it, viz. That they were so common, that there was no need to speak of them. There was hardly any Doctrine or Practice of the Christian Church, but had been either explained, confirmed, or regulated by some of these Councils; and had Image-Worship been then used, it would have been mentioned in some of them. But the Truth of it was, that it was a perfect Innovation, a Practice never used but among Heathens, and therefore this Pope could do no other than pass it over with such an insufficient, and sorry Answer.

(e) *Irene*] A second *Athalia* or *Jezabel*, not less zealous for Images, nor less scandalous and notorious for Wickedness and Cruelty; for she put out the Eyes of her Son *Constantine*, gave her self up to follow Wizzards and Sorcerers, put many good and innocent Persons to Death; a fit Instrument to set up this Doctrine of Devils.

new Council, and wrote to *Adrian* in her own, and her Son's Name, shewing him, that the Princes, her Predecessors, had destroy'd Images in the East, and had drawn the People, and all the *Eastern Churches* to their Persuasion; and that to reform this Abuse, they judged it fit to assemble a Council, and desired him to be there without fail, to hold the Place of the first Bishop in the World; and if he could not come himself, to send some Legates in his Place, that the ancient Tradition of the Church might be confirmed in this Synod; and that there might be no Schism hereafter in the Apostolick and Catholick Church, of which, Christ is the Head. They add, they send him *Constantine*, Bishop of *Leonce*, in *Sicily*, to bring him this Order, desiring him to send him back again with an Answer as soon as he can.

Tarasius, whom the Emperor and Empress had caused to be chosen Patriarch, though he was but a Layman, and Officer of the Crown, having excused his accepting of that Dignity, set forth the Division of the Church about Images, and the Necessity of calling a General Council. The Assembly assented to it, he was ordained Patriarch, and wrote Synodical Letters to the Patriarchs of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*. Pope *Adrian* sent * two Priests to hold his Place * Viz. *Petrus Vicedominus*, and *Petrus Hugumens*. in the Council; and the *Eastern Bishops* did the same. After their Arrival, the Emperor's Officers would have had the Council to sit at *Constantinople*; but this became impracticable, because many of them that had approved the Destruction of Images, would have no more Synods to be held about that Affair, which they thought to be already decided. As they were discouraging these Matters in private Meetings, the Emperor sent them word, that it was not lawful for them to meet without the Consent of the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and that in rigor, they were deposed. Nevertheless, they raised some (f) Tumult, when the Council assembled the first time, the 1st. Day of August, An. 786. and having caused the Soldiers of *Constantinople* to rise, they got them to besiege the Bishops, and to require with threatnings, that no Council should be held. So they were forced to separate themselves; and to the end they might hold another without constraint, they sent the Soldiers to the Army, under pretence, that the *Agareniens* had made Incursions into the Empire. After this the Council was assembled at *Nice* about the end of 787. The Pope's Legates held the first place there, *Tarasius* Patriarch of *Constantinople* the 2d. the Deputies of the *Eastern Bishops* the 3d. after them *Agapetus* Bishop of *Casarea* in *Cappadocia*, *John* Bishop of *Ephesus*, *Constantine* Metropolitan of *Cyprus*, with 250. Bishops, or Archbishops, and above 100. Presbyters or Monks, and two Commissioners of the Emperor and the Empress.

The first Action or Session was held the 24th. of September in the Church of *St. Sophia*, after they had declar'd the Cause of holding of the Council, they read the Letter of the Empress *Irene*, and the Emperor, wherein they both assure them, that they have assembled the Synod with the consent of the Patriarchs; that they leave the Bishops at full Liberty,

(f) Tumult] The true Cause of this Tumult was, that the Image-Worshippers being resolved to carry the Point, having gotten so powerful, as well as zealous Patron of their Idolatry, as *Irene* the Empress was, would have shut the contrary Party out of the Council, who thereupon endeavour'd to gain Admission by Force, that their Doctrine might not be condemned unheard. This being granted them, they carried themselves peaceably, as well in Publick, as in their Disputes in the Councils, which they managed with such undeniable Arguments drawn from Holy Scripture, that the Image-Worshippers were obliged to dissolve the Council at *Constantinople* without accomplishing their Design. But not long after by the Empress's Order they called another Council at *Nice*, where they established Idolatry by a Law, the Empress's Guards keeping the Iconoclasts from entering the Council, and her self undertaking to put the Constitutions of it in Force.

to speak their mind; that *Paul* the last Patriarch of *Constantinople*; acknowledging the Fault he had committed in receiving the Synod, which enjoyn'd the destroying of Images, having quitted his See, he had caused *Tarasius* to be chosen in his Room; that he had refused this Dignity; but being urged to accept of it, he had required a Synod might be held, to suppress the Schism which divided the Church in the point of Images; that according to his request they had called this Council; that they exhorted them to judge justly and courageously, to condemn Errors, and establish the Truth, in order to bringing Peace back again into the Church; that they had received Letters from Pope *Adrian*, which they would have read in the Assembly, with the Papers sent by the *Eastern* Bishops. After the reading of this Letter, *Basil* Bishop of *Ankyra*, *Theodosius* of *Myra*, made very large Declarations, that they did honour, reverence and worship Images, and that they were sorry for having been of another Persuasion; and they were received. After them, *Hypatius* Bishop of *Nice*, and four others, who had been caballing the year before, did also present themselves to be received, declaring that they did admit of Image Worship. These gave an Occasion to examine, how and in what Quality they should be received. They searched several Ecclesiastical Laws touching the manner of receiving Hereticks. Thereupon they read the 53. Canon of the Apostles, the 8th. Canon of the *Nicene* Council, the 3d. of the Council of *Ephesus*, the 1st. Canon of *St. Basil's* Epistle to *Amphilochius*, a Letter of the same Father to the *Evesians*, the Definition of the Council of *Ephesus* against the *Messalians*, *St. Athanasius's* Letter to *Ruffinian*, the Judgment of the Council of *Chalcedon* about the Reception of the Bishops, who had assisted at the Council of *Ephesus* under *Dioscorus*, and some Abstracts of their Ecclesiastical Histories of *Rufinus* and *Socrates*. They debated, whether they ought to receive converted Hereticks so, as to leave them in the Sacerdotal Dignity. Some insisted upon *Athanasius's* Letter to *Ruffinian*, which imports that they shall be admitted to Penance, but shall not continue in the Clergy; but it was answered, that it was to be understood of *Heresiarchs* only. Some voted, that according to the *Nicene* Council, they should lay Hands on them anew; but some said, that the Council did not mean a new Consecration, but a simple Ceremony of Imposition of Hands. They enquired, whether the Heresie of the *Iconoclasts*, was greater or lesser than the former Heresies; and there was nothing determined upon that Point. Lastly, after many Allegations, they declared, that those who return'd from their Heresie, yea, and those also who had been ordain'd by Hereticks, were to be received and to keep their Dignity; if there was nothing else that hindred them from continuing in the Degree of Clerks.

In the second Action of the 26th. of the same Month, after *Gregory*, Bishop of *Neo-caesarea*, had presented himself, and owned that he had done amiss in rejecting Image-Worship, they read Pope *Adrian's* Letter to *Constantine* and *Irene*, in which having commended their Zeal, he establisheth the Worship of Images, and affirms, that the Church of *Rome* received it by Tradition from *St. Peter*. He proves by a false Relation, that in *St. Sylvester's* time, *St. Peter's* and *St. Paul's* Pictures were in the Church. He alledges the Opposition his Predecessors had made to the destroying of Images. He exhorts the Emperor, to re-establish the Use of them in the *East*, as it was established in the *West*. He says, that Christians do not make their Images God; but use them as Me-

morials of the Worship due to God and his Saints. He grounds the Use of them upon several Instances of the Old Testament, as those of the Sacrifices, the Mercy-seat, the Cherubims, and the Brazen Serpent, and upon some Testimonies of the Fathers, which are either supposititious, or impertinent, proving nothing at all, or proving only the Use of Images, but not that any Worship was paid to them. Nevertheless, *Adrian* does not only maintain, that it is useful to have Images, to teach the Ignorant the things which they represent, to remember them of the Saints, to stir up Piety and Compunction; but besides, he will have them to be worshipped. To this Letter *Anastasius* adds many Lines, wherein the Pope entreats the Emperor. 1. To cause the Council held against Images to be rejected and anathematiz'd, and to restore those that had been persecuted for defending of them. 2. To cause *St. Peter's* Patrimony to be restored him. 3. To order that all the Archbishops of his Diocese shall receive Ordination from him. 4. To maintain the Church of *Rome's* Primacy. 5. To hinder the Patriarch of *Constantinople* from assuming the Title of Universal Bishop. 6. Not to leave *Tarasius* in the See of *Constantinople*, to which he was advanced, being a Layman. 7. He acquaints him with *Charles the Great's* Victories, and his Beneficence to the *Roman* Church. 'Tis no hard Matter to apprehend, why the *Greeks* did not transcribe these Articles; nay, the Pope's Legates durst not perhaps present them to the Synod in which *Tarasius* presided. They read another of *Adrian's* Letters, written to *Tarasius*, in which, having freely expressed to him how much his Ordination had troubled him, he commends his Confession of Faith, and exhorts him to procure the Condemnation of the Synod, which had rejected Images. After the reading of the Letter, the Pope's Legates asked *Tarasius*, whether he did not approve of it. He answered, he did, and declared he did affectionately worship the Images of Christ, the Virgin, Holy Angels, and of all the Saints, though he worshipped God only with a Sovereign Worship of *Latria*, and put his Trust in him alone. The Synod approved of this Declaration, and the Pope's Letter. All the Bishops made the same Declaration severally, and the Abbots followed them.

In the third Action, of the 28th. or 29th. of the same Month of *September*, *Gregory* of *Neo-caesarea* was admitted, though with much Contradiction, after he had read a Retraction of his old Opinions, and Profession of Faith about Images. The rest of the Bishops that abjured, were likewise received, and took their Place in the Council. Then was read *Tarasius's* Synodical Letter, sent to the Patriarchs, in which, to his Confession of Faith about the Trinity, and the Incarnation, he adds the Intercession of Saints, of the Virgin, the Angels, and the Worship of Images. Therein he owns but six General Councils. They also read the Letter of *Theodosius* of *Jerusalem*, approved by the *Eastern* Bishops; in which, after a long Confession of Faith about the Trinity and Incarnation, he adds the Worship of Saints and Images. The Bishops approved these Writings, and rejected the Council against Images.

In the fourth Action, *Tarasius* caused (g) the Testimonies of the Scripture and the Fathers, whereby he pretended the Worship of Images was authorized, to be read. They alledge but three Passages of the Old Testament, where mention is made of the Cherubims upon the Mercy-Seat, and one Passage of the New, taken out of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 9. where the Cherubims are mentioned, and what was

(g) Testimonies of Scriptures, and Fathers, whereby he pretended the Worship of Images to be authorized. This Learned Sorbonist, in the Recitation of these Testimonies, hath so ingenuously owned both the Falshood and Impertinency of them, that it is needless to spend any further Pains or Time upon a Confutation, there being not any one pertinent Allegation, or genuine Proof out of any ancient Author, to prove the Worship of Images lawful. All that can fairly be gathered from them is

this, that some Images have been made by Christians, and allowed a Civil Use, or at most, but an Historical Use in the Church, which none disallows, so long as they are kept within those Bounds, and not suffered to become an Object of Worship, though but in an inferior Sense, which is Idolatry. Yet if any one desires an Answer to them, the Abridgment of the *Caroline* Books, which our Author gives us at the end of this Council, will give him Satisfaction.

in the Tabernacle. The Bishops insist upon this, and pretend, that the Cherubims had Humane Faces, and that the Use of Images is thus established in the Old Testament. I leave you to judge, whether that be a sufficient Proof. Then they quote a Place out of St. Chrysostome, taken out of St. Meletius's Panegyrick, which proves only, that the Faithful being affectionate to that Saint, did not only repeat his Name, but moreover represented his Picture upon Rings, Cups, Glasses, Bed-Curtains, and in many other Places; but he does not speak at all of the publick Worship of Meletius's Pictures. The next Passage alledged by them, under St. Chrysostome's Name, is drawn out of an Homily, which shews that there is but one Legislator in the Old and the New Testament, which is not this Saint's, as we shewed in the Criticism of his Works. The Author of this Homily says, that he beheld with Pleasure a goodly Picture, wherein was represented an Angel putting to flight some Barbarian Troops. The Passage of St. Gregory Nyssen, which they alledge here, does not prove it much better, though this Father speaks in other Places of the Pictures representing the Conflicts of the Martyrs, set up in some Churches. That of St. Cyril proves the Use of Images among Christians, as well as that of St. Basil, in St. Barlaam's Panegyrick; which Passage is cited out of its Place, in this Council. But it is hard to understand how they can draw a good convincing Argument for Image-Worship, from what is reported by St. Gregory Nazianzen, that a debauched Woman was persuaded to leave off her Lewdness, by beholding a Picture, representing Polemon's Change of Life, whom Xenocrates converted from his Vices. Do they believe that Polemon, the Heathen's Picture, deserved any Religious Worship? 'Tis true, St. Gregory Nazianzen says, that Picture was venerable (*τιμωμή*); but he means no more but this, that it was well done, and did inspire some Respect for the Manner of the Painting; which shews, that though this kind of Epithets (Holy, Venerable) were said somewhere else of the Pictures of Saints, that would not come up to an invincible Proof, that they ought to be honoured; but only, that what was represented in them, did inspire some Reverence and Devotion. Antipater of Bostra speaks of the Statue, which the Woman, cured of the Bloody-Flux, erected to Christ. But this does neither prove the Worship of Images, nor the common Use made of them in Churches. The Passage of Asterius of Amasea, is quoted more pertinently, and proves, that on St. Euphemia's Day, they did expose the Picture of the Martyrdom of this Saint. The Narrative of a Miracle of a Woman troubled with a Pain in her Back, for speaking with little Respect to St. Anastasius's Relicks, which they were bringing over from Persia, is indeed a Proof of the Worshipping of Relicks, but not of Images; therefore the Sicilian Bishops add, that a Woman possessed with a Devil, was cured at Rome by St. Anastasius's Image. Then they bring in a Supposititious Piece, falsely attributed to St. Athanasius; importing, that the Jews of Berytus, having used Christ's Image, as the Gospel relates, that their Fathers used Christ himself; and having at last pierced his Side with a Spear, there came out of it Blood and Water, and that so many Miracles were wrought by it, that an infinite Number of Jews being convinced by them, turned Christians, and received Baptism. This Relation is followed with two Letters of St. Nilus, whereof the one, directed to Heliodorus, is alledged to prove the Vertue of Images, though it shews only the Vertue of the Intercession of Saints; and the other to Olympiodorus, had been alledged by the Iconoclasts, and falsified, as it's pretended. They quoted a Passage out of Maximus, who, in the Relation of what passed between him and Theodosius, reports, that they brought the Holy Gospels, the Cross, with the Image of Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary, that they saluted them, and laid their Hands on them, to confirm what they had agreed upon. This Pas-

sage is fitter than the other to prove Image-Worship; yet they wrangle a while about the Word (Saluting) which they pretend was not expressive and strong enough; nevertheless it was concluded, it was enough to honour them with a Kiss or Salutation, and that God only was worshipped with a Worship of Latria. The 82d. Canon of the Council in Trullo, is indeed a Proof of the Use of Christ's Images, but it does not establish the Worship of them. The Passage of Leontius Bishop of Cyprus is more formal, and establisheth the outward Worship of Images, by rejecting the ill Interpretation that might be put on it. Those of Anastasius Sinaita prove only the Honour due to Saints and Angels. That which is drawn out of the Spiritual Meadow, and recited under Sophronius's Name, though this Work belongs to John Moschus, contains an Answer so strange and exorbitant, that I don't believe any body would approve of it. They say, it was made to a solitary Man, vexed with the Evil Spirit of Fornication, who understanding from that Evil Spirit, that he would let him alone, if he would give over worshipping the Virgin's Image, consulted his Abbot what he should do, and received from him this Answer, which I do not think fit to translate. *Expedi autem tibi potius, ut non dimittas in civitate ista lupanar, in quod non ita oas quam ut recuses adorare Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum cum propria Matre in sua imagine.* Notwithstanding, this Instance was made use of, to prove, that they who had sworn to persist in Heresie, were not bound to keep that Oath; because that good Monk having promised the Devil with an Oath that he would do what he desired of him, if he would let him alone, did not regard that Oath. The Miracles related in the Acts of St. Cosmus, and St. Damian, do prove an excessive Devotion to the Images of Saints, if the Authority and Antiquity of those Acts were well established; but it being otherwise, no convincing Proof can be drawn out of them. The Passage cited under St. Chrysostome's Name, taken out of an Homily upon the Washing, is doubtful; and were it true, it does not concern Saints Images, but the Nature of God's Image which is in Man. Those of St. Athanasius and St. Basil are more impertinent yet, for the perfect Resemblance of the Son of God, with his Father, whose Image he is, is spoken of. The latter, cited under the Title of St. Basil to Julian, which to the Confession of Faith joins the Worship of Saints and Images, is a Supposititious Piece. The Stories taken out of the Lives of St. Symeon, St. John the Faster, of St. Mary the Egyptian, and other such Acts are of no great Authority. After they had recited these Extracts, they read the Letter of Pope Gregory the second to German of Constantinople, wherein he established the Worship of Images, and three Letters of this Patriarch of Constantinople upon the same Subject, wherein he does acknowledge, that the Worship paid to Images is but an outward Worship, expressing the inward Veneration Men have for what is represented thereby. All the Bishops approved this Opinion, and anathematized those that brake down Images, and those also who did not reverence and salute them. After this, Euthymius, Bishop of Sardis, read, in the Name of the Council, a Confession of Faith, in which, to the Articles concerning the Trinity and Incarnation, they add Praying to Saints, their Intercession, the Honour due to them, and to Crosses, to Saints Relicks, to the Saints and the venerable Images, which we honour, which we embrace, and worship respectfully, especially the Images of Christ's Humanity, and those of the Holy Virgin, Mother of God; those of the Angels, who, though incorporeal, have appeared under Humane Shapes to the Just; and lastly, those of the Apostles, Prophets, Martyrs, and other Saints, which is the end of this Action.

In the 5th. which was held the 4th. of October, they alledge several Pieces, to shew that the Iconoclasts had done, what some other Hereticks had attempted before them. The first Passage is St. Cyril's, accusing

2d. Nicene
Council.

2d. Nicene
Council.

Sermon of *John of Thessalonica*; assuring, that not only Mens Pictures may be drawn, but Angels also, by reason they are Corporeal. The fourth, is an Abstract of a Dispute between a Jew and a Christian, wherein the Christian answering the Jew, who charged him with adoring of Images, tells him, that Christians do not adore them, but preserve and behold them, adoring and invoking God. The fifth is a Fragment of a false Itinerary of the Apostles, which had been cited by the *Iconoclasts*. The Council does reject and anathematize it, and condemns it to the Fire; and, to prove the Falsity of this Monument cites a Passage of *Amphilochius*. There was no need of this, for that Monument is visibly Apocryphal. They reject also a Testimony of *Eusebius* to *Euphratius*; which Passage proved nothing, neither for, nor against Images; yet it gave an Occasion to condemn the Memory and Writings of *Eusebius*, against whom they cite *Antipater of Bostra*. The sixth Piece alledged by the Council, is an Extract of the Ecclesiastical History of one *John*, whom they call the *Separate*, who says, that Christians would not have Angels Pictures to be drawn, and that *Philoxenus* could not endure Doves. They prove by a Passage of *St. Sabas's* Life, that *Philoxenus* was one of the Hereticks Enemies to the Council of *Chalcedon*. They cite in the eighth Place, a Fragment of the Council of *Constantinople*, held under *Mennas*, where *Severus* is accused of breaking down Altars and taking away the Doves hanging over them; saying, *Doves ought not to be called the Holy Ghost*. In the ninth, they report a Testimony of *John*, Bishop of *Gabale*, accusing *Severus* of not honouring Angels. The tenth Monument is a Passage of *Constantinian*, Library-Keeper of the Church of *Constantinople*, maintaining, that no Image can be made of the Deity; but of Christ's Humanity there may. The eleventh is a Passage of *Evagrius's* History, about Christ's Image, sent to *Agbarus*. The 12th. are some Extracts of the Spiritual Meadow. From all these Passages, they pretend to conclude, that the *Jews*, and *Pagans*, the *Samaritans*, the *Manicheans*, and the *Severians* were the first Enemies of Images. Lastly, they read an Account of the Origine of the breaking down of Images, shewing, that a certain *Jew* of *Tiberias*, counterfeiting himself to be a Diviner and Sorcerer, persuaded the King of the *Arabians* to order all Images to be taken away out of the Churches of the Christians in his Kingdom, promising him a long Life, if he would do it; that this Order being given out, the *Christians* refusing to take away the Images with their own Hands, the *Jews* and the *Arabians* had pulled them down, burnt, torn, or defaced them; that the King, instead of the long Life, which the Magician had promised him, died within two Years and some Months after, and that his Son put the Magician to Death, and suffered Images to be set up again. After this Relation, all the Bishops demanded the Restoration of Images; they called for some to be brought in, that they might honour them, and repeated the Anathema's against those that broke, or dishonoured them.

In the 6th. Action, held the 5th. or the 6th. of October, they read the Acts of the Council of *Constantinople*, held against Images, and a (b) Refutation of what is in this Council. The 1st. thing they quarrel at, is the Title it had assumed, of the *Holy seventh General Council*. They pretend, it cannot have those Titles, since it was not received, but contrariwise rejected, and anathematized by several Bishops; nor was it approved by the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Bishops about him, nor by his Vicars, nor by a Circular Letter, according to the usual Law of Councils. And lastly, that the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*, did not assent to it, neither in Person, nor by the great Bishops of their Provin-

(b) A Confutation of the Acts of the Council of Constantinople.] The Arguments drawn from the Scriptures and Fathers, which the Council of *Constantinople* insists upon, to shew the Incongruity of the Worship of Images to the Nature of God, and the Design of the Christian Religion, though not so clear and cogent as might be produced, yet are so weakly, and insufficiently an-

ces. Yet they do not question the Number of the the Bishops set down in the Acts of 338: but they say, that this Number could not make a General Legitimate Council, because those that composed it had swerved from the Truth, and embraced an Error. I omit the Prefaces of the Council of *Constantinople*, and the Reflections of the *Nicene* Council, which respect the Confession of Faith about the Trinity, and the Incarnation, and the Acknowledgment of what was decided in the six first General Councils, which are Articles which both Councils agreed in: But the former pretends, that they who make Images, do overthrow the six first Synods. The others contrariwise maintain, that they who condemn them do act contrary to the Spirit, and the Practice of the Bishops, who assisted at these Synods, and contrary to their Tradition. There is nothing weaker, than what the former do alledge, to prove, that the Use of Images is contrary to the Decision of the General Councils. They are nothing but meer *Petitiones Principii*, or evident Sophisms, which deserve no Refutation. There is one upon the Eucharist, which is nothing better than the rest. They pretend, that no Image of Christ ought to be made, because the Eucharist is the visible Image. To which, the Fathers of the second Council answer, that the Name of Image is not given to the unbloody Sacrifice, offered by the Priest, but it is the very Body, and the very Blood of Christ; that those Oblations, before the Sanctification, have been called Types by some of the Fathers, as by *Eusebius* of *Antioch*, and *St. Basil*; but after the Sanctification, they never were called Types or Images of Christ, and that they are believed, and properly called the Body and Blood of Christ. They add, that their very Adversaries could not forbear acknowledging this Truth, and that they confess in the same Place, that the Eucharist, by the Consecration, is made Christ's Body; which is an Argument, that the two Councils held the Reality of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, and that they differ only in the Expression, and the Name they give it; the one pretending, that the Eucharist, even after the Consecration, may be called and considered as an Image and a Type; and the others denying expressly, that the Fathers did ever give it that Name after the Consecration; which is not altogether true, though it cannot be said, that the Eucharist may be called a Type or Image, as other Images, and the whole Arguing grounded upon this Analogy be very weak.

The Bishops of the first Council deny Images to be of the Tradition of Christ, of the Apostles or of the Fathers. Those of the second, maintain them to be a Tradition of Christ, which was, not written, and prove it by the Story of the Statue, erected by the Woman with the Bloody-Flux to the Honour of Christ. I shall desire a better Proof of it. They alledge the other Proofs they had brought in, some of which do indeed shew the Use of Images was common in Churches in the 4th. and 5th. Century; but never a one comes up to the time of Jesus Christ, the Apostles, or their immediate Successors.

The Bishops of the first Council add, that there is no Prayer in the Church for the hallowing of Images. Those of the second answer, there are many Holy things in the Church which are not Hallowed by Prayer, but are Holy by their very Name; as the Cross and the Sacred Vessels, which are revered by reason of their Shape and Use; that it is so with Images which have Reverence paid them for the sake of that they represent, and of their Usefulness.

The Bishops of the first Council, charge them that honour Images of Saints, with lapsing into Heathenism. Those of the second, make a vigorous answer by the *Nicene* Fathers, that they may well pass for incon-
futable, till some better Answer of them appears, which since *M. du Pin* hath not done, but doth acknowledge the same. It is needless to stand upon the Justification of the Former, or labour to discover the Insufficiency of the Latter, which is so evident to every Reader,

Defence upon this Article, maintaining, that they worship them not as they worship God; but that they embrace and salute them, and pay them an outward Worship, to express their Veneration of the Saints represented by them; besides that, they use them for their own Instruction, and for raising Godly Motions in the Beholders.

From Reasons they come to Authorities, and first of all they alledge two Testimonies of the Scripture, where it is said, *That God is a Spirit, that they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth; and that no Man hath seen God at any time.* The Fathers of the Second Council answer, This cannot be understood but of the Deity, and cannot be applied to Christ's Humanity; thus confessing that they would not have approved of the Images of the Trinity.

The second Place of Scripture is that famous one of *Deuteronomy*, *Ye shall make to your selves no Graven Idols.* The Fathers of the second Council answer, this ought not to extend to the Images of Christians, but respects only the Jews and prophane Images, and that *Moses* himself explained this Precept, by making Cherubims by God's Order. I pass by the other places of Scripture, which are less pertinent by far than the preceding, to come to the Testimonies of the Fathers.

The first is that of St. *Epiphanius*, who will not have Christians to set up Images in Churches, nor in Church-Yards, nor even in their Houses. The Fathers of the second maintain this Letter to be false, that St. *Epiphanius* could not be of a contrary Mind to St. *Basil*, St. *Amphilochius*, St. *Gregory Nyssen*, and the other Fathers, who commanded the Use of Images. It had perhaps been better for them to say, That this Father speaks too harshly.

The Second Passage is drawn out of St. *Gregory Nazianzen's* Verses, where it is said, Men ought not to have their Trust and Hope in Colours, but in their Hearts. This Passage is of a dubious Sense, and does no way concern Images; but 'tis a moral Reflection, according to the Remark of the Fathers of the Second *Nicene* Council, wherein this Father observes, that Men ought not to place their Confidence in worldly Goods, which he compares to Colours, but in a good Conscience.

The Passages of St. *Basil* are yet of a larger Sense: they say, that Scripture does represent to us the Images of the Souls of Saints, but not of their Bodies. This does not overthrow other Images; neither should they have alledged against Images a Place taken out of an Homily which is not St. *Chrysostom's*.

The Passage of St. *Athanasius*, that Creatures ought not to be worshipped, is only against Idols. That of *Amphilochius* hath something in it of greater Difficulty. This Father says, that we should have no care to paint out in Colours a Corporeal Representation of the Saints, because we have no need of them, but that we should imitate their Virtues. The Fathers of the Second Council make a large Discourse, to shift off this Passage. They shew the Usefulness of representing the Histories of Saints, which do both instruct and stir up Godly Motions. But they say, it's not enough to erect Temples and Images to their Honour, but we ought besides, to to imitate their Virtuous Actions. They pretend,

(i) It is defined, that Images may be placed in Churches, and revered, but not adored with the true Adoration due to God only. It is clear from the Premises, that this Definition of the Council was resolved upon before the Matter was heard, or canvassed; and though they had no Grounds for this Practice, either from Scripture, Reason, or Ecclesiastical Constitutions, yet Image-worship they must have; but then it must be a very nice sort too, a Veneration, not true Adoration; or, as *Tarasius* distinguishes, not with *Aargia*: Which evidently shews, that though they would not forsake Image-worship, yet they were afraid of incurring

Amphilochius meant nothing else, and explain themselves with a Passage of *Asterius* of *Amasea*, which gives them an opportunity to produce another of the same Father, proving the Use of Images.

The Bishops of the first Council had cited a Passage stronger yet than that of *Amphilochius*, drawn out of a Writing of *Theodotus* of *Ancyra*, saying, *That Christians have not learnt to draw the Pictures of the Faces of Saints, but to imitate their Virtues.* For (saith he) *what benefit can they, that would set up those kind of Representations, reap thereby? And what Spiritual Thought can they suggest to them? 'Tis a Vain Imagination, and a Diabolical Invention.* The Fathers of the second Council answer, *That this place of Theodotus is supposititious.* Perhaps it had been more to the purpose to observe, that the first part is *Theodotus's*, but the second is a Conclusion which their Adversaries draw from the place of *Theodotus*, to which they might easily have returned the same Answer they had done to that of *Amphilochius*.

The last Passage reported in the Acts of the Council of *Constantinople*, is a Passage taken out of a Letter [of *Eusebius Cesariensis*] to *Constantia Augusta*, which is attributed to that Author; yet is it not sure that it is his, and the Passage drawn out of it does not at all concern Images. Nevertheless the Fathers of the second Council, without telling us thus much, reject the Authority of *Eusebius*, charge him with being anathematized, represent him as a *Theopassian*, who hath condemned Images, and rank him with *Severus*, *Peter Gnaphæus*, *Philoxenus*, &c. believing it advantageous to them, that *Eusebius* should be their Adversary, and the Enemy of Images.

The Definitions of the Council of *Constantinople* follow these Testimonies: they forbid all sorts of Persons to make, to worship, or to set up in Churches, or in private Houses, any Image, upon pain of Deposition, if it be a Bishop, a Priest, or a Deacon; or of Excommunication, if it be a Monk, or a Layman; and it enjoins them to be dealt withal according to the Rigour of the Imperial Laws, as Adversaries of God's Laws, and Enemies of their Ancestors Doctrines. But they forbid to take the Sacred Vessels under that pretence, or to make them pass for Images; as also the Veils, the Vestments, and the other things used in the Sacred Ministry. This Declaration is joined with the Anathematizing of those, that do not receive the Doctrine of the six First Councils. They are also anathematized, who make Images of Christ, or of the Saints, after the Acclamations to the Emperors *Leo* and *Constantine*, and Imprecations against *German*, *Gregory*, and *John Damascene*, who are anathematized and deposed. The Council of *Nice* confutes these Definitions in every Article.

The 7th. Action was held the 13th. of October. It contains a Confession of Faith, in the end whereof (i) it is defined, that the Holy and Venerable Images may be exposed to the sight, as well as the Cross, both those which are made in Colours, upon Cloath, and those of another kind; that they may be placed in Churches, set upon Sacred Vessels, upon Sacerdotal Vestments, upon the Walls and Tables, in Houses; and in the Highways, viz. The Images of Jesus Christ and the Virgin, of the Angels and

the Guilt of Idolatry by it, which they thought to save by a nice distinction of Veneration and Adoration, or as the Modern *Romanists*, *Auxens*, and *Aargia*. But this will not serve the turn, nor clear the Guilt, for, as *Aquinas* and his Followers have at large proved, where any Thing is worshipped merely for the sake of another, it must have the same kind of Worship given it, which is given to the Thing represented by it. And then if they give the Image any Veneration, notwithstanding this distinction, it must be a Divine Worship, the same which is given to God, and that is gross Idolatry.

2d. Nicene
Council.

Saints, that they are useful to remember Men of them, and to renew the Desire of the Saints; that they may be kissed and revered, but not adored with the true Adoration, due to God alone; that Incense and Wax-candles may be burnt before them, as they are before the Cross; because the Reverence paid to them passeth to their Object; and they that honour them, honour those represented by them. This Confession is followed with a Letter of the Council to the Emperor and Empress, and a Circular Letter to all the Bishops and Churches.

Anastasius the Library-keeper, who translated the Acts of this Council, reckons but seven Actions, and attributes to the last the Canons, and *Tarasius's* Letters. But in the *Greek* Edition, there is an 8th. Action of the 20th. of *September*, because what is related there, was indeed transacted at *Constantinople*, whither the Patriarch and Bishops went, to give an account of their Proceedings to the Emperor and the Empress. They were kindly entertained by them, and the Empress her self would be present at the Synod, to hear the Acclamations of the Bishops in her commendation. She caused the Definition of the Council to be read, and asked the Bishops, whether it had been made by the Unanimous Consent of all. It was approved by many Acclamations, and presented by the Patriarch to the Empress, who subscribed it, and caused it to be subscribed by the Emperor, her Son. After that, the Acclamations began again, to wish a long Life to the Empress, and the Emperor: These being over, some of the chief Testimonies, alledged in the behalf of Images, were read before the Lords and the People. After the reading of them, the Bishops, the great Lords, and the People made many Acclamations.

There are 22 Canons of this Council yet extant, which *Anastasius* attributes to the 7th. Action.

In the first, they confirm the ancient Decrees of the Councils, [as well Provincial, as General,] and anathematiz'd those which are anathematiz'd by them, and deposed those which are deposed by them, and suspend and put to Penance those, which they have ordained to be suspended and put to Penance.

In the 2d. they ordain, That they shall examine, whether he, who is preferred to the dignity of a Bishop, be skilful in the Psalter, the Gospel, St. *Paul's* Epistles, and the Canons; and whether he be able to instruct his People in the Commandments of God, and in their other Practical Duties.

The 3d. declares all the Elections of Bishops or Priests, made by Princes, to be void. It ordains, That Bishops shall be chosen by other Bishops, and thereupon cites the Canon of the *Nicene* Council, which does not speak of the Election, but of the Ordination [of Bishops:] For of old time the Election did belong to the Clergy and People, and the Ordination to the Bishops.

The 4th. is against the Bishops, who take Money for deposing or excommunicating a Clerk.

The 5th. degrades those, who did boast of having ordained for Money, and renews the Canonical Laws against *Simonists*.

The 6th. renews the Canon of the *Nicene* Council for the holding of Provincial Synods. It threatens with Excommunication those Princes who would hinder it, and imposes Canonical Penalties upon the Metropolitans who should neglect it; and forbids them to take any thing which the Bishops have brought with them to the Synod.

The 7th. ordains, that some Relicks of Saints shall be put into the Temples, which have been consecrated without any Relicks being put into them, and the accustomed Prayers used at that Ceremony. It forbids Bishops, upon pain of Deposition, hereafter to consecrate a Temple without Relicks.

The 8th. forbids baptizing or receiving the *Jews*, unless they be thoroughly converted.

The 9th. ordains, that all the Works made against Images shall be put in the Palace of the Patriarch of

Constantinople, among the Heretical Books. It threatens to depose or excommunicate those that shall conceal them.

The 10th. forbids the Admission of Clerks into Chappels or Churches, without permission from their Bishop.

The 11th. ordains, that there shall be Stewards in all Churches, yea and gives the Bishop of *Constantinople* leave to put some in the Metropolitan Churches, if the Metropolitans neglect to do it. The same is ordained for Monasteries.

The 12th. forbids Bishops and Abbots to yield up, or to give away unwarrantably, their Churches, or Monastery Lands or Revenues.

The 13th. ordains, that Monasteries and Bishops Houses shall be repaired, and restored to their proper uses, and shall no more be suffered to serve for publick Inns.

The 14th. forbids such Children as have indeed received the Tonsure, but not the Imposition of the Bishops hands, to read in the Desk. It gives the Abbots, who are Priests, leave to make Readers for their own Monastery only, whom the *Chorepiscopi* are permitted to ordain.

The 15th. forbids a Clerk to be entitled to two Churches.

The 16th. forbids Bishops, and other Clergymen, to wear gay and fine Garments to make themselves taken notice of. It orders those to be punished, who laugh at such Clerks as are meanly clad. It is observed there, that in former times all Men consecrated to God went plainly and modestly apparell'd, because, as St. *Basil* says, any Garment which is not put on for Necessity, but for Ornament, carrieth a suspicion of Pride.

The 17th. forbids to undertake the building of Oratories, or Chappels, without a sufficient Fund to defray the Charges necessary for finishing of them.

The 18th. forbids Women to live in Bishops Houses, or in Monasteries of Men.

The 19th. prohibits taking any thing for Orders, or Entrance into Monasteries, upon pain of Deposition for the Bishops, and such Abbots as are Priests; and for Abbesses and Abbots who are not Priests, upon pain of Expulsion from their Monasteries. Nevertheless it permits those, who are admitted into Monasteries, or their Parents or Relations, to give voluntary Gifts; yet upon this condition, that those Gifts shall belong to the Monasteries, whether he that is admitted stays or goes away, unless the Emperor turn him out.

The 20th. prohibits making double Monasteries, that is, for Men and Women; and as for those that are founded, it ordains, that the Monks and Nuns shall dwell in two several Houses, that they shall not see one another, nor have any Commerce together.

The 21st. forbids Monks to quit their own Monastery to go to others.

The 22d. forbids Monks to eat with Women, unless it be needful for their Spiritual Good or upon a Journey, yea though they be their Relations.

Moreover, to the Acts of this Council is joyned a Panegyrick, pronounced in Commendation of it by *Epiphanius* Deacon of *Cantana* in *Sicily*; a Letter of *Tarasius* to Pope *Adrian*, about the Subject of the Council; another Letter of the same Person against the *Simonists*, in which he hath gathered together several Canons upon that Subject; another Letter of his to *John* the Abbot, upon the Definition of the 2d. *Nicene* Council, and against *Simoniacal* Ordinations.

The Acts of this Council being brought to *Rome*, they sent Extracts of them into *France*, where they had a different Practice about Image-worship. They were indeed permitted to have them, and to put them in their Churches; but they could not endure that any Worship or Honour should be paid them, whilst the Cross and Sacred Vessels were permitted to be honoured. *Charles*, who was then King of *France*,

2d. Nicene
Council.

France, and afterwards was Emperor, caused these Extracts to be examined by * some Bishops of his Kingdom, who composed a Treatise to vindicate their own Usage, and to answer the Proofs alledged in the Council of Nice for the Worship of Images. This Work was put out by Charles's Order, and under his Name, within three Years, or thereabouts, after the Nicene Council. It is divided into four Books.

* Of whom Alcuin was the chief; and R. Hoveden says, He it was that composed the Caroline Books.

In the Preface having observed, that the Church, redeemed with the precious Blood of Christ her Spouse, washed with the saving Water of Baptism, fed with the precious Blood of her Saviour, and anointed with Holy Oyl, is sometimes assaulted by Hereticks and Infidels, and sometimes vexed by the Quarrels of the Schismatics and the Proud; that she is an Ark, containing those that are to be saved, figured by that of Noah; which undergoes the Storms of the Deluge of this World, without any danger of Shipwreck; which does not yield to the deep and deadly Whirlpools of this World, and which cannot be overcome by the Hostile Powers wherewith she is surrounded, by reason Christ does continually fight for her; so that she does still withstand her Enemies, and inviolably maintain the true Faith and Confession of the Trinity. That she is a Holy Mother, without Spot and Corruption, always fruitful, and yet a Virgin; that the more she is set on by the Contradictions of the World, the more she encreases in Virtue; the lower she is brought, the higher she raiseth up her self. After this *Eulogium* of the Church, they add in Charles's Name, That, seeing he hath taken the Reins of his Kingdom in his hands, being in the Bosom of this Church, he is obliged to endeavour her Vindication and Prosperity; that not only the Princes, but the Bishops also of the East, puffed up with sinful Pride, had swerved from the Holy Doctrine, and the Apostolick Tradition, and do cry up impertinent and ridiculous Synods, to make themselves famous to Posterity; that some years ago they had held in Greece a certain Synod full of Imprudence and Indiscretion, in which they went about to abolish the use of Images, which the Ancients have introduced as an Ornament, and a Remembrance of Things past, and to attribute to Images what God hath said of Idols: But 'tis plain there's a Difference between an Image and an Idol; because Images are for Ornament and Remembrance, whereas Idols are made for destroying Souls by an impious Adoration, and vain Superstition. That the Bishops of this Council had been so blind, as to anathematize all those who had Images in Churches, and so boast, that their Emperor Constantine had freed them from Idols. That besides this, there was another Synod held about three years since, composed of the Successors of those of the former Council, yea and of those that had assisted at it, which was not less erroneous and faulty than the former, though it took a clean contrary way. That the Bishops of this Synod order Images to be adored, which those of the former would not permit to be had or seen; and that whenever these find Images to be spoken of, whether in the Scripture, or in the Writings of the Fathers, they conclude from thence, that they ought to be worshipped. That thus they both fall into contrary Absurdities; those, confounding the Use, and the Adoration of Images; and the other, believing Idols and Images to be one and the same thing. As for us, says he, being content with what we find in the Gospels, and the Apostles' Writings, and instructed by the Works of the Fathers, who have not swerved from him, who is the Way and the Truth, we receive the 6. first Councils, and reject all the Novelties both of the first and the second Synod. And as to the Acts of this latter, which are destitute of Eloquence and common Sense, being come to us, we thought our

selves bound to write against their Errors, to the end, that if their Writing should defile the Hands of those that shall hold it, or the Ears of those that shall hear it, the Poison which it might instil, may be expell'd by our Treatise, supported by the Authority of the Scripture; and that this weak Enemy, which is come from the East, may be subdued in the West by the Sentiments of the Holy Fathers, which we have produced. In fine, we have undertaken this Work with the consent of the Bishops of the Kingdom which God hath given us, not out of any ambitious Design, but animated with the Zeal of God's House, and the Love of Truth; because, as it is a holy Thing to pursue good Things, so it is a great Sin to consent to Evil. This is the Subject of his Preface.

In the first Book, after having made some Curfory Observations upon some Terms of the Council, he shews, that the places of the Scripture, alledged in that Council for Image-Worship, being explained in their genuine Sense, and according to the Fathers, do not at all prove what they pretend. In the first Chapter, he reproves this Expression in the Letter of Constantine and Irene; By him that reigns with us: He says, that it is a piece of intolerable Rashness in Princes, to compare their Reign to that of God. He says, that, properly speaking, God alone reigns, and Princes reign, but improperly, as none but He is really Immortal and True, and all other Things are Immortal and True only by Participation. In the 2d. he charges them with too much Boldness, in saying, that God hath chosen them, who do truly seek his Glory. He finds fault in the 3d. with their calling their Letter *Scripta Divalia*, as a profane Expression: Nay, he would not have the Dead called *Diva Memoriae*; and he says, that 'tis Ambition, not Apostolical Tradition, that brought in that Expression. In the 4th. Chapter, he blames another Expression of their Letter to Pope Adrian, *We beseech your Holiness, or rather that God, who suffers none to perish, beseeches you*. He calls this Expression, a wretched way of speaking, and an execrable Error; because he who is God, and hath a Sovereign Empire over all his Creatures, cannot debase himself so, as to beseech them. In the 5th. Chapter he observes, that 'tis a great Crime to explain any thing in another manner, than it ought to be understood. In the 6th. he says, that when there arises any Question in the Church, they ought above all to consult the Church of Rome, which is preferr'd before all others, and that no Writings should be made use of, but such as she receiveth: That as St. Peter was preferr'd before all the Apostles, so the Church of Rome is above all other Churches, and is the first of the Apostolical Churches, and so much the more, because she holds her Primacy from the Authority of Jesus Christ himself, and not from the Constitutions of Synods; that St. Paul also hath contributed to the Establishing of the Church, that she might have all the Authority of both those Apostles. He quotes the Passage of St. Jerome to Damasus, and observes that his Father Pepin enjoyn'd the French and German Churches to follow the Roman Usage in the singing of Divine Service. I do not well see, what the Author of this Book aim'd at in this place; it being evident, that the Church of Rome was contrary to his Pretension, and that Pope Adrian had been consulted, and had approved the Decision of the Synod which he confutes. In the following Chapters, he runs over the Proofs and Passages out of the Old Testament alledged by the Council, or by particular Bishops in the Council, and shews at large that they signifie nothing for the Worshipping of Images. He insists more particularly upon the Cherubims, and maintains that no Worship was paid them. He confesses that it is said, that Abraham worshipped the People of the Land of Idub, and that Nathan worshipped David; but he pretends there was a great Difference between Men living and Images. He allows that those may be saluted and revered upon the Account of

2d. Nicene Council.

the Dignity they have ; but he cannot endure the same should be done to a Picture, made with Colours, which can neither see, nor walk, nor feel.

2d. Nicene Council.

In the 2d. Book he finisheth his Answer to the places of the Scripture they had made use of, to authorize Images, and begins in the 13th. ch. to answer the Authorities of the Fathers, or of other Ecclesiastical Records. In this, having made a Protestation, that he does not forbid having Images, but only worshipping of them, he answers the Testimony drawn from the Acts of *Sylvester*, wherein it was said, that this Pope had caused the Images of the 12. Apostles to be carried to *Constantine*; he answers, I say, this does not prove that he caused them to be worshipped, but only that he shewed them, to raise his Mind by these visible Signs to things invisible; that, tho' he had persuaded him to honour them, which he did not; it was to lead that Prince, who was newly converted, by things visible to the knowledge of the invisible. And lastly, tho' those Acts of *Sylvester* be read by several Orthodox Persons, yet they are not of sufficient Authority, to decide controverted Points. In the 14th. ch. and the 15th. he shews that the Passage of *Athanasius*, alledged by the Council, proves nothing at all. In the 16th. he exclaims mightily, that they had applied to the Images a Passage of *St. Austine*, which is meant of the Son of God. In the 17th. he says, he does not answer *St. Gregory Nyssen*, whose Life and Writings are unknown to him. In the following Chapters, he shews, that the Passage, drawn out of the 16th. Council, and those of *St. John Chrysostome*, and *St. Cyril* prove nothing at all for the Worship of Images. In the 21st. he maintains, that the Adoring of Images is prejudicial to our Duty to God, but not the suffering them in Churches for a Remembrance of things past, and for an Ornament he consents, as he tells us in the next Chapter, that those of a weak and dull Memory use them, to put them in mind of things; but he will not yield, that they should pay them any Worship. He proves in the 23d. ch. that this was Pope *St. Gregory's* Opinion. In the 24th. he owns, that Men may be bowed to, and revered; but he denieth, that the same may be done to inanimate Images. He pretends in the 25th. that Image-Worship is not grounded upon any Example of the Apostles. In the 26th. he affirms it to be a great Temerity, to compare Images with the Ark; but he says in the 27th. 'tis a kind of Impiety to compare them to the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood. He speaks of the Consecration of the Eucharist very plainly and clearly, and he intimates in the end, that the Eucharist was still given to Children newly baptized. Lastly, he is not willing that Images should be compar'd even to the Cross, to the sacred Vessels, and to the Books of the Gospels and the Holy Scripture. As to this Article he is in the wrong, and all his Reasonings are meer Sophisms; for indeed the Cross, the sacred Vessels and the Books are no less inanimate Creatures than Images, and deserve neither more nor less Adoration. If then we may pay an (k) outward Worship to the Cross, because it puts us in mind of that, which Christ was nailed to, and to sacred Vessels, because of the Use made of them, and to sacred Books, because of what they contain, thereby to shew our inward Respect and Worship of Christ, the Holy Mysteries, and the Truths of the Holy Scripture: Why should we not likewise honour with an outward Worship the Images of Jesus Christ, of the Virgin and the Saints for a simple Testimony of our inward Veneration of the things represented by them, according to the common No-

(k) If we may pay an outward Worship to the Cross, sacred Vessels, Bibles, &c. Why should we not also honour the Images of Jesus Christ? If the Worship be the same, we grant the Idolatry is the same, but who ever bowed down to the Book of the Bible, or the sacred Vessels and prayed to them, tho' but with a relative Worship. There is an inferior sort of Respect and Honour due to all things consecrated to God's Service, or instrumental in his Worship, whereby tho' no Man worships or

tion of Men? There can be no Difference at all, but from the Practice of the Church, receiving the Worship of the one, and not of the other. But when the Church pleases to approve of this, as well as that, the one can no more be condemned than the other. *Anastasius* is in the right then, when in the Preface to the Translation of the Acts of the *Nicene Council*, he urgeth this reason, as a convincing Argument against the Opinion of the *French*. They say, quoth he, That no Work of Mens Hands is to be worshipped; as tho' the Book of the Gospels were not the Work of Men, which they adore by kissing it, and the Sign of the Cross, which Christians do worship every where, tho' it be a Wooden, Golden, or Silver'd Cross, different from that which Christ was fastened to. But let us come again to *Charles the Great*. In the 31st. Chapter, he cries out against the Council's anathematizing those, who do not worship Images. He pretends that hereby they have declared their Fathers Hereticks, and they being so, could neither consecrate nor impose Hands; from whence it follows, that their Successors are not true Priests, nor true Bishops. Thereupon he opposeth the Practice of the *West* to that of the *East*. 'We pray, says he, and give Alms, according to the Practice of the Church for our Fathers, and they anathematize them. We beg Rest for them in the Sacrifices of the Mass, and they make Imprecations against them in their Councils. We remember them in our Prayers, and they do not mention them, but to condemn them. We pray, that they may rest in *Abraham's Bosom*, and they wish them to be damned with Hereticks.' Yet he confesses they were both mistaken; the former in condemning the Use of Images for ever, the latter in commending them to be adored; those in throwing them to the Fire, these in burning Incense to them; the former in avoiding the sight of them, the latter in continually embracing of them; those in anathematizing those that have them, and these in condemning those that do not worship them. Then he concludes with propounding the Judgment of the *French*, which holds the mean between both. 'We do not believe, saith he, they ought to be abolished, as the former have done; but then we do not declare, that they are to be adored as the latter have done. But let us adore God alone, and let us reverence his Saints according to the ancient Tradition of the Church. We tolerate Images in the Church, to serve as an Ornament, and if they please, as a Memorial of things past. On the one hand we avoid too great a Severity, and on the other a base Flattery. We avoid Malice and Sottishness: We are neither too bold nor too weak; and thereby we shew to those that run into contrary Extreams, the Way they ought to keep in going to Christ.

The 3d. Book begins with a Confession of Faith, in which, having set forth the Doctrine of the Church about the *Trinity* and the *Incarnation*, he recites the other Articles of the Creed, and remarks upon that of the Resurrection, that Men shall have the same Body; upon that of the Life Eternal, that the Happiness and the Torments shall be greater or lesser, according to the Difference of Virtues or Crimes; upon that of Baptism, that it ought to be administered to Children. Then he adds, that the *Gallican Churches* believe, that a Man fallen into Sin after Baptism may be saved by Repentance; that they receive the Number of the Canonical Books, own'd for such by the Authority of the Church; that they believe God hath created all Souls; that they anathematize those, who believe them to be a Portion of the Divine Substance; that they do also condemn those that say,

adores them, yet he so far respects them, as not to put them to any common or prophane Uses, but keeps them clean and decent; and this all Persons may be allowed to give to the Holy Bible and Sacred Vessels, used in the Service of God (which is all that is intended by Worship in these Books) and yet it may be and is unlawful to worship the Images of Jesus Christ and his Saints, as the *Nicene Fathers* have decreed; for all Respect is not Worship.

that

2d. Nicene
Council.

2d. Nicene
Council.

that they have formerly sinned in Heaven, before they were sent into the Bodies; that they abhor those that affirm God hath commanded any thing impossible to Man, and that the Commandments cannot all be obey'd by every particular Person, but only by every Christian Society in common; those that condemn first Marriage, with the *Manichees*, and the second with *Cataphryges*; that they anathematize them that say, that Jesus Christ did lie out of necessity, or weakness of the Flesh; or that he could not do all he would, that they condemn the Heresie of *Jovinian*, who denied there should be any Difference in the other Life between Mens Merits, and affirmed Men should have there the Virtues neglected by them here below. Lastly, that they confess Free Will, so as to assert that Men do continually stand in need of God's Assistance, and that they are persuaded, that they do err, who say with *Manicheus*, that Man cannot avoid Sin; as also those who assert with *Jovinian*, that Man is not capable of Sin, because both have Free Will. This is the Abridgment of the Confession of Faith, which the Author of these Books tell us, he hath expressed in St. *Jerome's* own words. In the 2d. Chapter, he upbraids *Tarasius* with his hasty and precipitated Election, and Promotion to Holy Orders. In the 3d. he finds fault with the Expression he had used, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father by the Son: He said they ought to believe that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, and brings in several Proofs of this Doctrine, blaming *Tarasius* for expressing his Mind so, more than those who only said he proceeded from the Father, without joyning the Son to him, tho' in the 8th. Chapter he suspects all them that omitted it, to be in an Error. In the 4th. he reproves *Theodorus* for saying that the Son hath no other Principle but the Father. He believes that that Expression seems to insinuate that the Son is not the Principle himself, and that it may occasion one to think, that he believ'd him Posterior to his Father. In the 5th. he taxeth one Expression more of *Tarasius's* upon the *Trinity*; but he could not endure, that most of those Bishops add to their Confession of Faith the Worship of Images, and does vehemently complain of it in the following Chapters. He taketh it worse yet, that they should dare to anathematize those of a contrary Mind. He taketh it ill in the 14th. and 15th. Chapters, that the Empress and the Emperor medled with that Business: But methinks he should have remembered, that the Emperors had concerned themselves more in the other Councils, and should have considered that he did busie himself about it in the *West* more than *Irene* had done in the *East*. In the 15th. Chapter, he answers this Objection: They honour the Statues, Medals, and Pictures of Princes; why shall they not honour those of Christ and the Saints? He answers it, I say, by maintaining that the former ought not to be honoured. In the 16th. Chapter, he answers another Reason of the Council, that the Honour of the Image passeth to that which is represented by it. He says first of all, that he cannot apprehend, how a Cloath and some Colours have any Relation to a Saint in Heaven; that it is not so with Pictures, as with Relicks which have a natural Relation to the Saints; that it depends upon the Painter's Fancy to make Folks believe that a Picture represents a Saint, or a false God. He asks, whether those that have most Resemblance deserve more Honour than those of a more precious Matter. He says, that if the latter, 'tis then the Matter that they respect; and if the former, it seems an unjust thing to prefer them before those that are more valuable. Lastly, he confesses, that the Learned may indeed honour Images without any Abuse, by referring the Honour not to what they are, but to what they signify; but he believes that they can be nothing else but a Cause of Offence, and a stumbling Block to the ignorant, who reverence and adore nothing but what they see; from whence he concludes, 'tis better quite to abolish the Use of them. This shews,

VOL. II.

that the Dispute between the *Greeks* and the *French* was not so much a Dispute about Doctrine as Practice. In the 17th. Chapter he condemns an Expression of *Constantine's* Bishop of *Cyprus*, but it was badly translated; for whereas that Bishop had said, that he honoured Images and adored the Trinity; he maketh him say, that he honoured Images with the Honour due to the Trinity: So 'tis an Error of Fact. In the following Chapters he reproves the Opinions of some Bishops. In the 21st. he derides the instance of *Polemon's* Picture. The two next Chapters are against the Praises given to the Art of Painting. In the 24th. he pretends there's no Comparison to be made between the Relicks of Saints and their Images. In the 25th. he says, that the Miracles done by Images are no Argument that they are to be adored, for then Thorn-Bushes should be adored, because God spake to *Moses* out of a burning Bush; Fringes should be adored, because Jesus Christ healed the Woman with the Bloody-flux, by the Fringe of his Garment; and Shadows too, because St. *Peter's* Shadow wrought Miracles. In the 26th. he laughs at *Theodosius* Bishop of *Myra*, who had related his Archdeacon's Dreams, to authorize Image-Worship. In the 30th. Chapter he confutes several Proofs alledged by the Council, because they were taken out of Apocryphal Histories. In the 31st. he taxeth with Impiety and Folly, the Answer of that Abbot, who told a Monk, it was better to frequent Bawdy-Houses, than not to adore the Images of Jesus Christ and the Virgin.

In the last Book he goes on to confute some Expressions of the Council, and of particular Men in the Council. He maintains no Wax Candles ought to be lighted, nor Incense to be burnt before Images, because they are senseless. He cannot endure, that the Council should compare those, who do not adore Images to Hereticks. He taketh it ill, that they should thus abuse their Predecessors, confessing nevertheless, that these last were to blame for burning and destroying Images. He rejects the Story of Christ's Image sent to *Agbarus*, as a mere-Fable. He makes no great reckoning of another Story of a Monk, who had set up a Lamp before an Image, which burnt several Days. He adds, that tho' those Miracles were true, it would not follow from thence that Images were to be adored. Lastly, having derided them for many of their Arguments, he maintains, That that Synod was to blame for assuming the Title of Universal; because whatever is Universal ought to be conformable to the Tradition and Practice of all the Churches. 'Thus, says he, if it fall out, that the Bishops of two or three Provinces meet together; and that according to the Authority of Tradition, they establish some Doctrine, or make some Rule agreeable to the Doctrine and Discipline of the ancient Church; what they do is Catholick, and their Council may be called Universal; because tho' it be not composed of the Bishops of all the Parts of the World, what it does is agreeable to the Faith and Tradition of the whole Church; but contrariwise, if they go about to establish some Novelty, what they do is not Catholick. In a Word, whatsoever is Ecclesiastical is Catholick, and whatsoever is Catholick is Universal, all that is Universal is not New. Thus the Synod, we speak of, being contrary to the Sentiments of the Universal Church, we cannot own it for Universal.

These Books were brought to *Rome* and presented to Pope *Adrian*, by *Angilbert*, *Charles's* Ambassador. The Pope, who maintain'd the Council, having received them, thought himself bound to answer them by a Writing directed to *Charles* the Great himself. First of all he vindicates the Expressions of *Tarasius* and the other *Greeks* about the Holy Ghost, by some Passages of the Fathers, which have spoken after the same manner, supposing those *Greeks* did not differ from the *Roman* Church about the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Then he defends the Passages of the Scripture, the Reasons, Authorities and Histories alledged

*** L

alleged by the Synod, and censured in the *Caroline* Books; but his Answers are but weak. He pretends, that St. Gregory taught in his Letter to *Secundinus*, that Images deserved some Worship. He cites some Passages out of the Fathers upon almost every Article; but he maketh such Applications of several of them, that very few would approve of, and he vindicates some Reasonings, that some could hardly relish. But about the End, having reported all the Testimonies of St. Gregory, he expresseth himself about Image-Worship after a manner, which cannot be possibly condemned; for he says that Images are not revered, but so far forth as they raise up our Mind to God, and that whosoever prostrates himself before Christ's Image, 'tis God whom he adores; that likewise we shew our Love and Affection to the Saint by the Means of his Images. He adds, that the *Nicene* Synod, having established this Doctrine, and rejected the false Synod which would have quite abolished Images, he had received it as a Legitimate and Catholick Synod; that nevertheless he had not yet written an Answer to the Emperor, lest he should relapse into the Error of his Predecessors; which he fear'd so much the more, because writing to him, to exhort him to restore Images, he had also demanded of him the Restitution of the Dioceses of the Church of *Rome*, and of the Patrimonies also belonging to it, but had received no Answer from him. Wherefore he says, that if *Charles* will give him Leave, in his Answer to the *Greek* Emperor, he will approve of what he hath done for Images; but at the same time he will maintain the Quarrel with him, about the Dioceses and Patrimonies of the Church of *Rome*, and if he do not restore them, he will declare him an Heretick for it.

This Letter of *Adrian* did not alter the Sentiments, nor the Practice of *Charles*, nor of the *Gallican* Churches: For in the Synods of *Francfort* held in 794. where this Question was again debated after they had done with the Opinion of *Felix* and *Elipandus*; they rejected the Opinion of the *Greeks*, and condemned all Manner of Adoration or Worship of Images. This is the second Canon of that Synod.

In the *East*, tho' the Definition of the *Nicene* Council had restored Images in several Places, yet it was not equally observed every where, and *Constantine* himself abrogated it. *Leo* the 5th. his Successor re-established the Decree of the Council of *Constantinople*; so that the *East* was altogether divided in the Point of Images, Anno 820. *Michael Balbus* succeeding *Leo*, and being desirous to settle Peace in the Church assembled a Council, in which they followed the Sentiments of the *Gallican* Church, for they took away the Images that were set up in dirty Corners; and they left those, which were in high Places, where they might be seen, that the Picture might serve for a Book to instruct the Ignorant, upon Condition that they should not adore them, and that they should burn no Lamps nor Incense before them. Some of those that were most zealous for Image Worship, came to *Rome* to complain of this Council; which forced *Michael* to send Deputies thither, whom he directed to *Lewis* the Meek, that he might help them with his Credit. This Emperor finding such a fair Opportunity to procure Peace to the Church, sent *Freculphus* and *Adegarius* to *Rome*, with the Deputies of the *Greek* Emperor, to treat of this Affair. But *Lewis's* Envoys not finding the *Romans* complying, desired the Pope's Consent, that their Master might discuss the Matter with his Bishops. Having obtained it, they came back again to *France*. They held at *Paris*, An. 824. an Assembly of the ablest Bishops of the Kingdom; and this Question was searched to the Bottom. They read *Adrian's* first Letter, written upon this Subject to *Constantine* and *Irène*. They found that he was in the Right to condemn those that broke down Images; but that he acted indiscreetly, when he permitted them to be adored; because they may be had, but may not be adored. They examined a-new the *Nicene* Synod held

in pursuit of this Letter; and they thought that they found in these Acts, that it did not only establish Image-Worship, but enjoyn'd them to be called Holy, and to believe some Holiness to be derived from them. They caused what had been written by *Charles* the Great's Order against this Council to be read over again. They made no great Reckoning of *Adrian's* Answers, in which nothing was found considerable, besides the Pope's Name, which they did bear. They complain'd, that this Abuse was established at *Rome* and in *Italy*. They commended the Emperor for opposing this pretended Superstition, and for endeavouring to restore Peace to the Church, by avoiding the Extrems which both Sides had run into. They approved the prudent Carriage of the Deputies in demanding this Matter should be debated in *France*. They judged, that for the better effecting of their Design, it was necessary to lay the Fault at the *Greeks* Door, to pacifie the Pope, and to commend his Zeal and Piety, yet so as to establish the Truth by Places out of the Scripture and the Fathers, and to set it forth with Sincerity and Modesty; that by this Means they might draw the Pope over and reclaim him; and if they could not effect that, they would still have the Satisfaction to have spoken the Truth and done their Duty. Lastly, they made a Collection of the Passages of the Fathers, divided into fifteen Chapters: The 1st. is against those that pretend, that Images ought to be taken away out of the Churches, and to be defaced upon the Sacred Vessels. The 2d. contains some Testimonies of St. Gregory the Great about Images: Shewing the Use that may be made of them. The 3d. contains Testimonies of St. *Austine* against those that would adore them, or that believe any Holiness or Vertue to be in them. The 4th. contains several other Passages against the Worshipping of Images. The 5th. contains some Passages, proving that Saints and their Relicks may be honoured, but not adored; from whence it is inferred, that much less may Incense be burnt and offered to them. The 6th. contains some Testimonies against them that maintain Image-Worship, by the Usage of those that introduce it. In the 7th. they pretend to shew from some Passages of the Fathers, that honouring of Images ought to be avoided, that we may give no Scandal to the Weak. In the 8th. and 9th. they bring some Explications of the Fathers, to shew that the Passage of *Genesis*, where it is said, that *Jacob* worshipped * the Top of his Son *Joseph's* Staff; and that of the Kings, where *Nathan* is said to have worshipped *David*, proves nothing for the worshipping of Images. The 10th. Chapter contains a Testimony of St. *Austine*, concerning the Sacred Vessels. The 11th. contains one about the Cherubims. The 12th. contains some to shew, that Adoration is due to God alone. The 13th. contains several of them upon the Cross, to prove that a great Difference is to be made between that and Images. This Difference is confirmed in the 14th. Chapter, by the Usage of the Church, which hath always worshipped the Cross, and used that Sign in Benedictions, Consecrations, and Exorcisms. In the 15th. they advise the Destroyers of Images, not to take from thence an Occasion to break them down, or to scorn them; and they put them in mind, that have them, not to adore them: And to establish the Truth of these two Points, they cite several Passages of the Fathers. Lastly, they drew up the Form of two Letters, one whereof is that which *Lewis* was to write to the Pope, to exhort him to procure the Peace of the Church, by correcting the Abuses that stir up Tumults in the *East*; some being for adoring of Images, and others against the very tolerating of them. The 2d. is a Form of that which they will have the Pope to write to the *Greek* Emperors. It begins with a long Exhortation to submit themselves to the *Roman* Church, and to pay her Reverence; and then they advise the Emperors

* This is a false Translation. It ought to be, Worshipped upon the Top of his Staff, As Heb. 11. 21.

Emperors to restore Peace to the Church, by following the Opinion of the *French*, that is, by permitting Images to be had, but not to be honoured. Lastly, they alledge some of the most express Passages of the Fathers, to establish that Usage.

Lewis the Meek sent this Deliberation, and these Acts to Pope *Eugenius*, by *Jeremy*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and *Jonas*, Bishop of *Orleans*, and desired him by his Letter, to confer with them, about the Ambassage which he was to send into *Greece*. But, to give the Pope no cause of Jealousie, he says, He did not send them with these Papers to impose Laws upon him, or to take upon himself to teach him, but merely to give him an account of the Sentiments of the *Gallican* Church, and to contribute to the Peace of the Universal Church. He recommends them to him, and prays him to receive them favourably, and entreats him to endeavour the Re-union of the *Greek* Church, and to carry himself with great wariness in such a nice Affair as this is. He desireth that his Deputies may accompany those whom the Pope shall send into the East.

At the same time he gave the two Prelates, his Ambassadors, Instructions, wherein he charges them to shew to the Pope the Collection of the Passages made in the Assembly held at *Paris*, to examine the Businesses about Images, by his own Consent. He commands them to satisfy him about the Business of Images, to handle this Question gently and moderately, and to have a great care not to make him obstinate, by too openly resisting of him. At last, he warns them, that when that Business is ended, if yet the Peremptoriness of the *Romans* permits it, to ask the Pope, if he be not willing and desirous, that they should go into *Greece* with his Deputies: If he be willing, to send him word on't immediately, to the end, that at their return, they may find *Amalaricus* and *Halitgarius*, and before their Departure, to agree about the Place where the Deputies shall take Ship.

It is very probable, that the Pope and the *French* did not agree about this Matter; but this did not hinder the King from sending *Halitgarius*, Bishop of *Cambray*, and *Aufridus*, Abbot of *Nonantula*, into *Greece*, to the Emperor *Michael*. What they did concerning Images, is not known; it is only said, that they were well entertained. Perhaps they persuaded *Michael* to permit Images to be had. But this Emperor, and his Son *Theophilus*, were set against the Ordinance of the *Nicene* Council. This last being dead in 842, and his Wife *Theodora* being left in Possession of the Government, she re-established the Worship of Images, and the Authority of the *Nicene* Council. But the *French* and the *Germans* persisted long in their Usage, and it was very late ere they owned that Council, in the Room of which, they put that of *Frankfort*, as it appears by the Testimonies of several *French* Authors and Historiographers.

Now to re-capitulate in a few Words, what we could observe upon the Point of Images, from the beginning of the Church. It must be confessed, that in the three first Centuries, yea, and in the beginning of the Fourth, they were very scarce among Christians. Towards the end of the Fourth Century, they begun, especially in the East, to make Pictures and Images, and they grew very common in the Fifth: they represented in them the Conflicts of Martyrs, and Sacred Histories, to instruct those who could not read, and to stir them up to imitate the Constancy, and the other Virtues of those represented in these Pictures. Those of the Simpler and Weaker Sort, being moved with these Representations, by seeing the Saints Pictures thus drawn, could not forbear, expressing by outward Signs, the Esteem, Respect and Veneration they had for those represented therein. Thus was Image-Worship established, and was moreover fortified by the Miracles ascribed to them.

In the West, some Bishops at first would not suffer any Images, but the greater part agreed, that they

might be of some Use, and only hindered them from being honoured. But the Worshipping of Images being established in the East, was also received at *Rome*, whilst in *France*, *Germany*, and *England*, all outward Worshipping of them was unknown. This Difference did not occasion any Contest or Division between the Churches, when on a sudden a furious Storm rose in the East against Images, which was raised by the Emperor *Leo*, the *Isaurian*. He resolved to abolish them, and had Power enough to draw a great number of Bishops into his Opinion, and to get the Abolition of them to be ordered in a Council, and to be executed in the East. The Popes did always vigorously withstand that Decree, and maintained both the Use and the outward Worship of Images. The face of things was also soon changed in the East, and maugre the Opposition of several, the Empress *Irene* caused it to be decided in the *Nicene* Council, that Images might be had and honoured; and re-established the Use of them. This Decision had different Fortunes in the East, according to the Will and Humour of Princes; but at last it carried it. In the West, the *Italians* received it; but the *French*, *Germans*, and *English* rejected it; and without any regard to all the Contests in the East, in which they had no hand, they continued in their ancient Usage, equally rejecting the Opinion of those that were for abolishing the Images, and of those that were for paying Worship to them. They worshipped the Cross, the Sacred Vessels, the Gospels, the Relicks, but would not worship Images. They did what they could, that the West and the East might embrace their Discipline; yet without separating from the Communion of any Church. They continued long in this Practice, but at last they yielded, and the outward Worship of Images was brought in amongst them, as among the other People.

Some Reflections may be made upon these different Epochs, which will raise our Admiration of God's Conduct towards his Church in all these Changes. There's no doubt, but when Paganism was the prevailing Religion, it would have been dangerous for Christians to have Images or Statues, because they might have given occasion of Idolatry to them, who were newly recovered from it, and they might have given the Pagans reason to object to Christians, that they had, and worshipped Idols as they did: therefore it was fitting there should be no Images in those first Ages, especially in Churches, and that there should be no Worship paid them. Afterwards, People being better taught, more learned, and farther off from Idolatry, there was not so much Danger to propose them to them, and the Church being then more splendid in her Ceremonies, they served as Ornaments to Temples, and had their Use, because they set forth before their Eyes, the Actions of the Martyrs. There can be no doubt, but Pictures do not only bring to mind those we love, but moreover, representing their Actions lively, they make some Impression, and stir up Admiration and Esteem for them, and a Desire of imitating them. Therefore, there being no more danger of Idolatry, Why should not Christians have Images? Nevertheless, they that knew their People to be prone to Idolatry still, and were afraid lest Images should draw them back to it, they might take them away; and this justifies the Proceeding of St. *Epiphanius*, *Serenus*, and of some other Bishops. But to go about to break them, to burn them, to reduce them to Ashes, and to look upon those that have them as Idolaters; wholly to condemn Painters, and the Art of Painting, as the Bishops of the Council of *Constantinople* have done; 'tis a piece of intolerable Imprudence and Folly. As to the Worship that was paid them, 'tis certain it cannot be referred to the Images, and that they have no Veneration for the Matter they are made of, nor for their Shape and Form; but only they give some outward Signs before them of the Veneration they have for what's represented by them. This Worship being thus explained, as it hath been,

by most of the Defenders of Images, cannot be taxed nor accused of Idolatry, as even those who do not use them, do not deny. But then it cannot be said to be absolutely necessary; and those, who for some private Reasons, do not think themselves bound, for instance, to prostrate themselves before Images, to bow to them, to kiss them, to embrace them, to express their Reverence for that they represent; those I say, are not to be condemned as Hereticks, who will not do so, for some particular Reasons, either because the Practice of their Church is otherwise, or because they fear those outward Duties should be mistaken for Adorations; or lastly, because they do not believe the Worship of Images to be sufficiently warranted, seeing, to prove it, they have alledged a great number of false Pieces, or of impertinent Passages that prove nothing.

Moreover, the Proceeding of those Persons could not be blamed, who, to settle Peace in the Church, and to re-unite two opposite Parties, of which, the one were for breaking down all Images, and the other for honouring of them, endeavoured to make their own Usage to be received every where, and wrote to the Pope respectfully about it. This was the Temper of our *French* People, in the time of the *Nicene* Council, and after; thus they carried themselves: therefore they cannot be blamed. But then, the Worship paid to Images being well explained and understood by all, there being no more fear of Idolatry, the whole Church being agreed in the

Acknowledging of it: it would be a piece of Temerity in a private Man, or some private Churches, to refuse to comply with this Usage, and condemn those that honour them. (1) The Reformed Churches therefore are to blame, to go about to abolish the Worship and Use of Images. Only it were to be wished, 1. That great Care should be taken to instruct the People well in the Nature of the Worship paid to Images, and to teach the Simple that it is not paid to the Images properly, but to Jesus Christ, and to the Saints represented by them; and that the Image is only the Occasion of it, in as much as before it, they give outward Signs of the Worship rendered to the Object. 2. That the Abuses and Excesses committed in this Worship should be avoided, such as those, of kindling a greater Number of Tapers before the Images than before the Holy Sacrament, of Dressing and adorning them with so much Pomp, of Kneeling before them, sooner than before the Altar, where Christ's Body is kept, of believing some Vertue to be in one Image, which is not in another, &c. 3. Perhaps it were fitting, to suffer no Image of the Trinity, nor of the Deity, all the most zealous Defenders of Images having condemned these, and the Council of *Trent* having spoken but of the Images of Christ, and of the Saints. Besides, they should be more careful to remove profane Images, and all those that have something indecent and fabulous in them, from Churches.

(1) *The Reformed Churches are to blame for abolishing the Use and Worship of Images.* All the Reformed Churches are not so great Enemies to the Images of Christ or his Saints; but as the *Lutherans* do still allow them in their Churches for Ornament, or as Helps of Memory, without giving them any Worship: So, were it safe, and not offensive to many good Men, could many other Churches also. But we have so great Experience of the People's Proneness to Idolatry, and are so un-

satisfied with the Bowing down to them with a Relative Veneration, that we think it better to want the Historical, than run the Hazard of falling into the Idolatrous Use of them. And though we meet with very few of the *Romish* Communion, that are so moderate as our Historian, not to brand us with the odious and ignominious Name of Hereticks; yet we had rather, with *St. Paul*, worship God after the way that they call Heresie, than after that which Scripture calls Idolatry.

The Council of Northumberland.

Pope *Adrian* having sent two Legates into *England*, *Gregory of Ostia*, and *Theophylactus*, Bishop of *Todi*, they were very well entertained by the Kings, and the Bishops of the Country, and held a Council in *Northumberland* (*An. 787.*) in which they made the following Canons to be received.

1st. That the Faith of the *Nicene* Council should be maintained, even to the laying down of their Lives in the Defence of it, if need were.

2^d. That Baptism should be administered only according to the Order, and at the time appointed by the Canons, except in Case of Necessity; that all Persons should be obliged to learn the Creed and the Lord's Prayer; that the Sureties should be put in mind of the Obligation they had taken upon themselves, to take care that those whom they undertake for at the Font, be instructed in the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

3^d. That every year two Councils should be held; that the Bishops should visit their Dioceses, and watch carefully over their Flock.

4th. That they should take care to see their Clerks live Canonically, and their Monks regularly; that they wear different Garments; that Clerks be clad modestly and plain, and that of this, the Bishops, Abbots and Abbesses ought to be Examples to such as are under their Care.

5th. That after the Death of an Abbot or an Abbess, they should choose others in their Room, with the Bishop's Advice, and that they ought to be chosen out of the Monastery, if there were any fit for that Place; if not, that they are to be taken out of another Monastery.

6th. That Bishops shall ordain none Presbyters or Deacons, but Men of an exemplary Life, and such as are able to discharge their Functions well; that they that are ordained, shall remain in the Title and Degree, to which they are destined; and that no Clerk of another Church shall be received without Cause, and without Letters from his Bishop.

7th. That in all Churches, Divine Service shall be performed at the usual time, and with Reverence.

8th. That the old Privileges granted to Churches shall be preserved; but if any of them be found made against the Canonical Constitutions, at the Suit and Request of wicked Men, they shall be abrogated.

9th. That Clerks shall not eat by themselves, and in private.

10. That none shall come near the Altar, but reverently, and in decent Clothing, that the Oblations of the People shall be a whole Loaf of Bread, and not a bare Crust; that no Chalice or Patin shall be made of an Ox-horn, and that Bishops shall not undertake to judge in Secular Affairs.

In the 11th. Kings are exhorted to perform their Duty, and to govern like Christians.

The 12th. recommends Obedience due to Kings, and detests them that attempt any thing against their Life.

The 13th. exhorts the Grandees and the Rich to do Justice.

In the 14th. Fraud, Violence and Exactions are forbidden, and Concord, Peace, Union and Charity are recommended.

The 15th. prohibits illegitimate Marriages upon Pain of Anathema.

The

Of Northumberland. The 16th. deprives Bastards of the Right of Succession.
The 17th. enjoyns paying of Tythes, and forbids Usury.

The 18th. ordains that Christians shall perform their Vows.

The 19th. prohibits certain Customs, which seemed to them some Reminders of Heathenism, such, as to cut and slash themselves, to decide Controversies by Lot, to eat Horse-flesh, &c.

The 20th. enjoyns Confessing of Sins, and Re-

ceiving the Sacrament, and declares, that those shall not be pray'd for, who die without Confession.

These Articles were proposed in *Northumberland* by *Adrian's* Legates, in the Presence of *Osred II.* King of *Northumberland*, of the Archbishop of *York*, the Bishops, the Abbots and Lords, who received them, and promised to keep them, and subscribed them. From thence they were carried to *Offa*, King of the *Mercians*, and read in his Presence, in an Assembly, at which the Archbishop of *Canterbury* was present, with the Bishops, Abbots, and great Lords, who also received and subscribed them.

† The Council of Aquileia.

† Concilium Forojulense in Longo. *Of Aquileia.* THIS Council was held by *Paulinus* Bishop of *Aquileia*, An. 791. It begins with a long Explication of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*, and the *Creed*, in which it does chiefly establish these two Doctrines: That the *Holy Ghost* proceeds from the *Father*, and the *Son*; and, That *Jesus Christ* cannot be called an *Adoptive Son*. After this Exposition of Faith come 14 Canons.

The first is against *Simony*.

The 2d. upon that excellent degree of Virtue which is necessary for *Pastors*, [above their *People*.]

The 3d. against *Drunkennes*.

The 4th. against *Womens* cohabiting with *Clergymen*.

The 5th. forbids *Clerks* to meddle in *Secular Affairs*.

The 6th. forbids them *Secular Employments* and *Disertisements*, such as *Hunting*, *Musick*, *Dances*, &c.

The 7th. forbids the *Suffragan Bishops* of *Aquileia* to condemn a *Presbyter*, an *Abbot*, or a *Deacon*, without consulting the *Metropolitan*.

The 8th. prohibits unlawful *Marriages* between *Kindred*, and clandestine *Marriages* too. It ordains, that no *Marriage* shall be contracted but between *Parties*, which shall be known not to be a-kin; that there shall be an interval between *Betrothing* and *Marriage*; that the presence of the *Priest* shall be requisite; that *Kindred*, which shall be found to have married within the *Degrees* forbidden, shall be separated and put to *Penance*; that, if it be possible, they shall remain unmarried; but yet if they will have *Children*, or if they cannot keep their *Virginity*, they shall be permitted to marry others, and their *Children* shall be declared *Legitimate*.

The 9th. forbids to contract *Marriage* before 14 years of *Age*.

The 10th. forbids a *Man* or *Woman*, which have been divorced for *Adultery*, to marry again. It affirms, that *Jesus Christ* in this case permitted a *Man* only to put away his *Wife*, but not to marry another, and confirms this *Opinion* by the *Authority* of

St. Jerome. The common Practice was then contrary to this Law.

The 11th. declareth, that *Women*, of what condition soever, whether *Virgins* or *Widows*, which have promised to live *Single*, and have taken the *Habit* as a token of their *Promise* though they have not received the *Consecration* from the *Bishop*, shall inviolably keep their *Vow*; and if they do secretly marry, or suffer themselves to be defiled, they shall be punished according to the rigor of the *Civil Laws*; and besides this, they shall be put asunder, and do *Penance* all their *Life-time*, unless their *Bishop*, considering the greatness of their *Repentance*, shew them some favour; but at the point of *Death* they shall not be deprived of the *Viaticum*. Nevertheless none of them is permitted to take the *Religious Habit*, without her *Bishop's* Advice.

The 12th. forbids *Men* to enter, without great need, into the *Monasteries* of *Virgins*. It extends this *Prohibition* to all *Ecclesiastical Persons* under any pretence whatsoever, without permission from the *Bishop*; nay, it forbids the *Bishop* himself to go into them, unless in the company of his *Presbyters* and *Clerks*. It ordains, That whether he goes himself, or sends any other, to preach, and instruct *Religious Women*, the *Person* that does do it shall have *Witnesses* of his *Carriage*, that he may not be evil spoken of. It forbids *Abbeesses* and *Nuns* to leave their *Convents* to go to *Rome*, or on any other *Pilgrimages*.

The 13th. enjoyns the keeping of *Sunday*, beginning from the Hour of the *Vespers* of the *Saturday*; and for the due Solemnization of it, it ordains, That they shall first of all abstain from *Sin*, and every *Servile Work*; that they shall wholly give themselves to *Prayer*, and shall be present at all the *Divine Service*. It ordains also, that the other *Festivities* shall be kept; and exhorts *Presbyters* to give good *Examples* to the *People*.

The 14th. enjoyns the paying of *Tythes*.

The Council of Ratisbone.

Of Ratisbone. FELIX Bishop of *Urgel* in *Catalonia*, being consulted by *Elipandus* Bishop of *Toledo*, whether *Jesus Christ*, as *Man*, was an *Adoptive* or *Natural Son*? Answered him, That in this respect he was to be looked upon as an *Adoptive Son*. He maintained this *Opinion* by his *Writings*, and went about to spread it, not only in *Spain*, but also in *France* and *Germany*. But he found these *Bishops* opposite to

his *Error*; for being met together at *Ratisbone*, (an. 792.) they condemned it with this *Author*, who was sent to *Rome* to *Adrian*, who confirmed the *Sentence* of this *Synod*; and made *Felix* to recant. *Alcuin*, and *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, speak of this *Council*. There is mention also made of it in the ancient *Annals* of *France*.

The Council of Francfort.

Of Francfort. NOTwithstanding the Judgment of the former Council, the *Bishops* of *Spain* persisted in their *Error*. *Felix*, who seemed to have retracted it, maintained it anew, and *Elipandus* wrote a *Letter* to vindicate it. This *Letter* was confuted and condemned, First, by *Pope Adrian*; Secondly, by an *Italian Council*; and Lastly, by the Council

of *Francfort*, who wrote to *Elipandus*, and the other *Bishops* of *Spain*, *Letters*, in which they prove, both from the *Scripture* and the *Fathers*, that *Jesus Christ* ought to be called the *Natural Son* of *God*; and cannot be called an *Adoptive Son*, there being no *Division* nor *Separation* of the two *Natures*. *Charles* the Great wrote also to those *Bishops* a *Let-*

ter on purpose, wherein he presses them earnestly to retract their Error, and to follow the Sentiments of the Bishops. These four Letters are extant.

This Council of *Francfort* was assembled by the Order of *Charles* the Great, (*An.* 794.) in the Beginning of Summer. It was composed of 300. Bishops, or thereabouts, of *France*, *Italy*, and *Germany*. The Pope's Legates were at it, and it hath been long looked upon in *France* as an Universal Council. And indeed it National Councils in the *East*, and in *Africa*, have been stiled *Universal*; why should we not give

the same Title to a Council made up of the Bishops of the principal Kingdoms of the *West*? In this Council, the matter of Images was debated, and they decided the Question started by *Felix* and *Elipandus*, about the Title of Adoptive Son, which they gave to Jesus Christ. They made 56 Canons.

The 1st. is against the Error of those Bishops.

The 2^d. upon Images.

The other 54. have been set down among *Charles* the Great's Capitularies.

A Council of Rome under Pope Leo III.

THE Affair of *Felix* of *Urgel*, which had already been brought to *Rome* under *Adrian*, was examined there anew under Pope *Leo* the Third, in a Council of 57. Bishops, held in 799. of which *Felix* makes mention in his last Confession of Faith; and of which, some Fragments are extant.

Leo the Third relates in the first Action, how that Heresie, which was condemned by his Predecessor *Adrian*, was renewed, and began to spread.

In the 2^d. he describes, how *Felix*, having been condemned at *Ratisbone*, had after that retracted his Error at *Rome*, and made a solemn Promise upon St. *Peter's* Tomb, 'That he would no more call Jesus Christ the Adoptive Son of God, but did believe and call him his own proper Son.' He adds, that

since that time he had relapsed into his Error, and would not submit himself to the Judgment of the Council of *Francfort*, assembled by the Order of King *Charles*, which had condemned his Error, and had threatned with *Anathema* those that maintain'd it, if they persisted in it. That not yielding to this Judgment in the least, he had written against *Albinus* a Book full of Blasphemies and Errors, more horrid than those he had delivered heretofore.

In the 3^d. Action, the Pope representeth it as a thing necessary, that those that are in an Error be exhorted again to endeavour to reclaim them; and he anathematizes *Felix* of *Urgel*, if he will not abandon the Heretical Doctrine which he teaches, viz. That Jesus Christ is the adopted Son of God.

The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle against Felix.

IN the same year *Charles* the Great invited *Felix* of *Urgel* to *Aix-la-Chapelle*, promising him, that he should have the Liberty to propound to the Bishops, which he would call thither, all the Reasons and Allegations that he could produce to defend his own Sentiment, and that all the Proceedings in the Determination of this Question should be managed with full Liberty: Which was done by the Acknowledgment of *Felix* himself in a Confession of Faith;

for after he had alledged the Passages he had, *Alcuin* answered them, and did so clearly confute his Opinion by formal Passages of St. *Cyril*, St. *Gregory*, St. *Leo*, and other Fathers, and by the Authority of the Synod held at *Rome* a little before, that *Felix* did voluntarily abandon his Opinion, to embrace the Doctrine of the Church, and made an Orthodox Confession of Faith: Which was followed by those of his Adherents that were there with him.



A N HISTORY OF THE CONTROVERSIES

And Other

Ecclesiastical Affairs,

Transacted in the

CHURCH

In the Ninth Age.

CHAP. I.

Containing an Account of what passed in the Eastern and Western Churches at the Beginning of the Ninth Century about the Use and Worship of Images.

IN the beginning of the Ninth Century the Greek or Eastern Church enjoyed Peace, and the Worship of Images was received by the greatest part of the Members of it. The Emperor *Nicephorus* had chosen a Person of his own Name Patriarch of *Constantinople* in the year 806, who being of the same Judgment with the Emperor in the Use of Images, joyned with him in maintaining and upholding their Worship. Some little Differences there were between them, and *Theodorus Studita* about the Restoration of *Joseph*, the Steward of the Church of *Constantinople*, who had been deposed by the Patriarch *Tarasius*, *Nicephorus*'s Predecessor, but they were soon buried by the Death of the Emperor *Nicephorus*, which happened in the year 811; for *Michael Curopalates*, his Son-in-law and Successor, made up the Breach between *Theodorus*, *Joseph* Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, and *Nicephorus*. The Peace of the Church being thus restored again, the Emperor and *Nicephorus* unanimously used their utmost Endeavours to promote Image-worship, and root out some Reliques of the *Manichees*-Heretic, yet remaining in the East. But the State of Affairs was much changed by the Death of *Michael*, whom *Leo Armeniacus* having slain, possessed himself of his Throne. This Emperor was a Favourer of the *Iconoclasts*, who having been much kept under, and scarce daring to appear after the Death of *Constantinus Copronymus*, made use of their Interest with him, and procured the Banishment of their most inveterate Enemies, *Nicephorus*, *Theodorus Studita*, *Nicetas*, and several others, who were zealous Patrons of Image-worship. After the Death of *Leo*, *Michael*, surnamed *Balbus*, who succeeded him in 820. mitigated the Severity used against the Patrons of Images in the last Reign, and suffered several of them to return from their Exile, seeking out all fit means to bring the *Iconoclasts* and them to an Agreement, for which end he summoned both Parties to a Council. But the Image-worshippers refused to come to any Conference with their Adversaries, and boldly required him to restore the Bishops of their Judgment to their Sees again, and to depose the *Iconoclasts* in possession of them. *Michael* hearing this insolent Demand was very angry, and

immediately declared, that he would have all Images removed out of the City of *Constantinople*, which he had hitherto permitted, but his Resolution dyed with his Passion, and he left all Men at Liberty to worship Images, or not, as their Opinion was; yet he put out a Decree forbidding several Abuses then commonly practised in the Adoration of Images; as to remove Crosses out of the Churches, and put Images in their places, to adore the Images themselves, to adorn the Statues with Cloaths, to accept them as God-fathers and Godmothers to their Children in the Administration of Baptism, to cut off the Hair of those that professed a Monastick Life over them, to mingle their Colours with the Elements and deliver them to the Communicants, to put the Body of Jesus Christ between their Arms, and celebrate the Holy Mysteries in their Presence in their Houses. And that this Edict might take the better Effect, he commanded by the same, that the Images which stood in low Places should be removed, and those that stood more high should be permitted to stand, and that they might be only of an historical Use, and not be adored by the more weak and ignorant, he ordered, that no Tapers should be burnt, nor Incense offered in honour to them. *Michael* having thus published this Decree, was very desirous to have it approved by the Western Church, and for that end resolved to send his Ambassadors to *Rome* with rich Presents; and that he might be the better received by the Pope, he made his Application to *Lewis*, surnamed *Benignus*, by them desiring him to second his Petition, and assist him with his Interest. This Emperor thinking this a fit Opportunity of settling the Peace of the Church, sent two Ambassadors, *Treacphus* and *Adegarus* to *Rome* with the Deputies of the Greek Emperor, to treat of this Affair. But the *Romans* could not be brought to Compliance, nor not by the Ministers of *Lewis*, whereupon they requested, and obtained leave of the Pope, that their Matter might have this Question debated among his Bishops. With this Grant they returned into *France* to *Lewis*, who soon after in 824, summoned a Council of the most learned and judicious Bishops of his Realm, by whom this Question was thoroughly con-

About the Use and Worship of Images.

Council of Paris.

valled and examined. They first read Pope *Adrian's* Letter about the Use and Worship of Images upon this Subject, in which they found, that he did justly condemn those who demolished and defaced the Images, but thought that he had given too much Encouragement to the Adoration of them. Then they re-examined what the Synod of *Nice* had done by means of that Letter, and found, that in the Acts of their Council, they had not only established the Worship of Images, but had commanded them to be called *Holy*, by which they seemed, to them, to attribute some *Holiness* to them. They also read over the Book which *Charles* the Great had caused to be written against this Council, to which tho' Pope *Adrian* had given an Answer, yet they saw so little of Solidity in it, that they looked upon nothing in it worthy of their notice, but the Name it bore. They complain of the Rigueur and inflexible Humour of the Church-men in *Rome* and *Italy*, and commend the Moderation of the Emperor in avoiding the Heats of both Parties, and labouring so earnestly for the Peace of the Church. They commend the Prudence of the Ambassadors, who had obtained that that Question might be debated in *France*. They judged, there was no other way to make their design successful, but to make use of the Imperial Authority in settling what they should upon the most impartial Examination find to be true by plain Texts of Holy Scripture, and the Judgment of the Fathers, which they would do modestly and sincerely.

In the last place, they made a large Collection of Passages of the Fathers, which they divided into 15 Chapters. The first was against those that held, that Images ought to be wholly removed out of Churches, and Pictures blotted out which were engraven on the Holy Vessels of Ministration. The 2d. contains several Authorities out of *St. Gregory* the Great, shewing what profitable use may be made of Images. The 3d. is several Testimonies of *St. Augustine* against those that worshipped Images, and believed that they had any Holiness or Vertue in them. The 4th. contains several other Quotations against the Worship of Images. The 5th. proves by several Authorities that Saints and their Relicks may have some Honour given 'em, but not be adored, from whence they infer, that it is not lawful to burn Incense to Images. The 6th. contains some Testimonies against them that defend the Worship of Images by the common usage of them, which hath been lately introduced: In the 7th. they undertake to prove by several Passages of the Fathers, that even any Honour ought to be denied to Images, when it may give an offence to the weak. In the 8th. and 9th. they produce some Explications of the Fathers, to prove that the Text in *Genesis*, where 'tis said, that *Jacob* worshipped the top of his Son *Joseph's* Staff; and another in the *Kings*, where 'tis said, that *Nathan* worshipped *David*, do prove nothing for the Worship of Images. The 10th. contains a Testimony of *St. Augustine* concerning the Holy Vessels. The 11th. contains one touching the Cherubims. The 12th. contains some, which evince that Adoration is due to God only. The 13th. contains several about the Cross, which shew that a great difference is to be observed between that and Images, which is confirmed in the 14th. by the practice of the Church, which hath always given some Respect and Reverence to the Cross, by making use of that Sign in Benedictions, Consecrations, and Exorcisms. In the 15th. they exhort the *Iconoclasts*, who were for destroying all Images, not to take occasion from the former proofs to deface, beat down, or deride Images, since there is no Worship given, or intended to them; and to confirm the truth of these two Points, they recite several Passages of the Fathers. Last of all, they compose a Copy of two Letters, the one to be sent in the Name of the Emperor *Lewis* to the Pope, to exhort him to further the Peace of the Church, by removing those abuses which had raised so many troubles in the *East*. In it, some were for intimating that he worshipped Images, but others would not hear of it. The other was such a Form as they wished, that the Pope would write to the *Greek* Emperors. It begins with a long Exhortation to them, to submit to the Church of *Rome*, and pay all due respect to it; Then it advises the Emperors to restore the Peace of the Church, by permitting Images to be used, but not worshipped. And lastly, produces some most plain and remarkable Passages of the Fathers, to confirm and establish that usage of them, and none else, as lawful.

Lewis the King sent this Consultation, and these Acts, to Pope *Eugenius*, by *Jeremiah* Archbishop of *Sens*, and *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, and desired him in his Letter to confer with them about the Embassy, which he was to send into *Greece*. And that he might not give the Pope the least offence, which might serve for a pretence to fly off from this design, he says, that he did not send those Papers to him, to impose Laws upon him, or direct him, as a Master, but barely to represent to him the Judgment of the Church of *France*, and contribute all he could to the Peace of the Church Universal. He recommends them to him, prays him to accept them favourably, and beseeches him to use his utmost endeavours to re-unite the *Greek* Church, and to act with a great deal of Prudence and Caution in so difficult

and nice a Point as this is. He desires also, that his Ambassadors might go along with the Pope's into the *East*.

At the same time he gave the Bishops, whom he sent Ambassadors to the Pope some private Instructions, in which he charges them to shew the Pope the Collections of Authorities made by the Council held at *Paris*, to examine the business of Images according to the permission he had given them. He commands them to manifest his design to the Pope about Images, to treat of that Question with all Candor and Moderation, and to be very careful that they did not provoke him by opposing him too plainly. Lastly, He orders them that if they could not compleat the business, when they had done all they could, they should ask him whether they might not go with his Ambassadors into *Greece*, to which if he consented, they should immediately send him word, that at their return they might find *Amalaricus* and *Halitgarus*, who before they went should meet them at the place where they were to embark.

What the Resolution of the Pope was in this Affair is not known, but *Lewis* the Kind did send *Halitgarus* Bishop of *Cambray*, and *Ansvridus* Abbot of *Nonantula*, to the Emperor *Michael*, who received them kindly. Nevertheless, it doth not appear that their Negotiation had any good effect, for things remained almost in the same state in *Greece* as long as *Michael Balbus* lived, and after his Death his Son *Theophilus* used great severity against the Image-Worshippers. But the Empress *Theodora*, the Wife of *Theophilus*, becoming Mistress of the Empire [in the Minority of her Son *Michael*] after the Death of her Husband, which happened in 842. called a Council at *Constantinople*, in which the Worship of Images was again restored, the *Iconoclasts* condemned, and *Metbodius* made Patriarch of *Constantinople* in the Room of *John*, who was of the Party of the *Iconoclasts*. And thus the Controversie of Image-Worship was ended in the *East*.

In the *West*, *Claudius Clemens*, a Spanish Priest, and Scholar of *Felix Orgelitanus*, and afterwards Bishop of *Turin*, imitating the Conduct of *Serenus* Bishop of *Marseilles*, took up a Resolution not only to give no Honour to Images himself, but to remove them out of all the Churches of his Diocese, not sparing so much as the Cross it self. *Theodemirus*, [a *Benedictine*] Abbot, much disliked the Actions of this Bishop, being persuaded that Images, as *St. Gregory* taught him, were to be retain'd in Churches without giving them any Adoration. Whereupon he wrote a Letter to him, exhorting him to change his Opinion and Management. *Claudius* was so far from following his Advice, that he wrote a Defence of his Proceedings, wherein at large he confutes what he had said, and disproves the Use of Images he contended for. We have nothing remaining of this Letter, but what *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, and *Dungalus* the Monk, have preserved in their Confutations of it, by which it appears, that it was written with much Briskness and Closeness, full of Ingenuity and Subtlety. [*Melchior Goldastus*, in the end of his Collection de *Cultu Imaginum*, hath put all the Pieces of this Letter together, and in a small Treatise put them forth.]

This Writing of *Claudius* Bishop of *Turin*, being brought to the Court of *Lewis* the Kind, this Prince commanded the most learned Men, which he had about him, to examine it, who found great fault with it, and made a Collection of the most observable Assertions, which the Emperor sent to *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans* to confute, as having several Errors and Falsities in them. *Jonas* began that Work, but *Claudius* dying before he had finished it, he laid it aside, believing that his Error would be buried with him. But *Jonas* hearing afterwards, that he had left some Writings behind him, wherein he revived the Error of *Arrius*, and that his Opinion did begin to spread in his Country, he thought himself obliged to finish that Work. He divided it into three Parts: In the first, he maintains the Use of Images, the Invocation, Intercession and Worship of Saints, and the Veneration that is due to their Relicks. He confesses, that the *French* did not worship Images, reproved the *Greeks*, whom they supposed to adore them, and asserts, that it is absurd to represent the Divine Nature under Corporeal Figures. In the second, he maintains not only the Use, but Veneration of the Cross. In the last, he defends the Pilgrimages which were made to *Rome* out of Devotion, and answers, in the Name of *Theodemirus*, to that which *Claudius* of *Turin* had objected, viz. If that were a Piece of Penance to go to *Rome*, why had he received, and did retain in his Monastery 140. Monks, who entred thither only to do Penance? He answered, I say, that there were several Ways of doing Penance, and many different States. Men may either go into a Monastery, or go to *Rome*, with a Design of doing Penance; but those that have once taken upon them a Monastick Life, ought to observe the Rule, and live according to the Order of *St. Benedict*, keeping continually in their Monastery. In these Books, he sets down the very Words that had been taken out of the Letter of *Claudius* of *Turin*, and after he answers them, and confirms his Answers with the most solid Proofs he could find, as the Testimonies of *St. Jerome*, *St. Augustine*, *St. Gregory*, the Examples of the Saints,

About the Use and Worship of Images.

Cl. Clemens an Enemy to Images.

Jonas Bishop of Orleans's Judgment of Images.

About the Use and Worship of Images. Saints, most evident Miracles, and the Practice of the ancient Church. [This Work was printed at Cologne, 1554. in the Hæresiology at Basil, 1556. in Orthodoxogr. Tom. 2. p. 1526. and in Biblioth. Patrum, Paris 2d. Edition, p. 688. Tom. 4. Two other Treatises also are extant written by Jonas, viz. De Institutione Laicorum, lib. 3. & de Institutione Regia, lib. 1. in Dacherius's Spicileg. Tom. 1. & 5. p. 57.]

Dungal's Treatise of Images. Not long after the Deacon Dungal [a Monk of St. Dennis at Paris] wrote another Treatise against Claudius of Turin's Book, and dedicated it to the Emperor Lewis and Lotharius. In it he opposeth three Points, which that Bishop had delivered in his Treatise, That we ought to have no Images; that we ought not to worship the Cross; and that 'tis of no Advantage to visit the Churches where the Bodies of the Saints are laid, or honour their Relicks. He alledges a great number of Quotations of the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, as also of the Christian Poets, as St. Paulinus and Trudentius, to confute these Errors; and in the Conclusion demands, how a Bishop, who hates the Cross of our Lord, can baptize, consecrate the Chrism, confirm, bless or consecrate any thing, or celebrate the Communion, since none of these can be done without making the Sign of the Cross? And how he can celebrate Divine Service without invoking the Saints, and honouring their Relicks? In this Treatise of Dungal's there is little of his own, being nothing but a Collection of Passages out of Ecclesiastical Writers; what is his, is written in an harsh and unpleasant Style. [Tis extant in Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 14. p. 196.]

Opinion of Agobardus about Images. Agobardus, Archbishop of Lyons, seems not so great a Favourer of Images, for tho' indeed, at first, he seemed to oppose the Adoration of them only, against which he alledges several places out of the Fathers; yet afterwards he maintains, That we ought not to make use of these visible Signs to represent Things Spiritual by, nor give them a relative Worship in Respect to the Saints represented by them. He affirms, That in the ancient Church, the Images of Jesus Christ, and of the Apostles, were preserved rather for the Love they bore to them, and to put them in mind of them, than out of Religion, or to adore them. He is of Opinion, that it were fit upon this Occasion, wholly to suppress them, as being the Causes of much Superstition; in which he differs from the Judgment of the Church of France. [These Things he chiefly asserts in his Book de Picturis, & Imaginibus, which, together with his other Treatises, were printed at Paris, 1605. 8vo. by the care of Papyrus Massionus, who found the MS. by chance in a Book-binder's Shop After which his Works were printed again at Paris with Baluzius's Notes, 1666. 8vo. 2. Vol. an accurate Edition, but he endeavours to weaken his Authority against Image-Worship. This Edition is put in the Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 14. p. 234.]

Wal. Strabo's Judgment about Images. Walafridus Strabo, a Monk of Fulda, who wrote some time after Agobardus, speaks of Images with much more Moderation, for he not only approves the Use of them, but allows some Respect to be given to them. He observes, that we ought not to honour them with a direct Worship, but he would have us not to condemn them. He distinguishes them into three sorts, some of which signify some Mysteries, as the Ornaments of the Tabernacle and Temple, others which serve to perpetuate the Remembrance of sacred History, and others, which are made to impress upon our Hearts the Love of those Persons which they represent, as the Images of Jesus Christ and the Saints. Whereupon he says, that the Devotion with which the Faithful are touched, when they look upon and contemplate them, is not to be blamed, since they draw so much Profit from them; but he condemns the Superstition of those who honour them with Religious Worship. That as some worship them more than they need, so others reject them imprudently, as a kind of Idolatry; that this Question had stirred up great troubles among the Greeks. That in the time of Pope Gregory II. the Emperor Constantine had removed all Images, but that under Gregory III. there had been a Council called at Rome against the Heresie, in which it was appointed, That the Images should be set up again in the Churches according to the ancient Usage. Lastly, That the Complaint of the Greeks having been brought into France, had been confuted by a Synodical Writing by the Order of Lewis the Kind. That Claudius of Turin, who had revived that Error, died before he had received a Confutation. That Christians being well instructed, that none ought to be worshipped but God, and that the supreme Honour, that is due to him, can't be communicated to Saints or Martyrs, whom they invoke as Intercessors with him. These lawful and moderate Honours of Images are not to be rejected wholly. Non sunt omni-modi honesti & moderati Imaginum honores abjiciendi. That as we do not demolish Temples, altho' we believe God to be every where, and that he doth not dwell in them, so we ought not to deface Pictures as useless and noxious, because we are persuaded that we ought not to worship them. In fine, he says, that they have many Advantages; they are the Books of the Ignorant, and such as can't read, and teach them those Histories that they could hardly know any other way. He concludes, that we ought to have and love Images, and not render them useless by condemning them, lest the

VOL. II.

Irreverence which we shew them, should reflect upon them that are represented by them. Nevertheless, we ought to be careful not to corrupt our Faith by an excessive Worship of them, for fear lest by rendering too great honour to things corporeal, we should give just Ground of Suspicion, that we do not sufficiently consider things spiritual. [These things are spoken in his Treatise De Divinis Officiis, which was printed at Mentz, 1549. at Paris, 1610. and in Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 15. Other small Treatises of his are extant in Surinus & Canisius Antiq. Lection. Tom. 6. & Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 15.]

After this time I do not find that there was any Contest in the West about the Use and Worship of Images, which henceforward became common in France, Germany, and other Places. Let us now speak of the Authors chiefly engaged in this Controversy.

Nicephorus was but a Layman when he was chosen Patriarch of Constantinople, in 806. after the Death of Tarasius. He had passed some Part of his Life at Court, but had been for some time before his Election retired from the World; yet was no Monk. He was no sooner in Possession of the Patriarchal Dignity, but through Complaisance to the Emperor Nicephorus, he restored in a Council Joseph the Steward, who had crowned Theodota, whom Copronymus had married, having divorced his lawful Wife. Theodorus Studita and Plato violently opposed this Act, whereupon the Patriarch held a Council in 809. in which Joseph was not only confirmed in his Place, but the second Marriage of Constantine was declared lawful by Dispensation, and every one that should maintain the contrary, was anathematized. This Decision raised a great Quarrel between Nicephorus and Theodorus, who together with several Monks separated themselves from his Communion, and treated him as an Heretick, which Division continued till the Death of Nicephorus the Emperor. But the Emperor Michael put an End to this Schism, and made them Friends upon Condition, that Joseph should be displaced, and that the Monks for the future should obey the Patriarch in all things that were not manifestly contrary to the Faith and Law of God. From this time Nicephorus and Theodorus Studita were perfectly good Friends; and suffered Persecution together for the Worship of Images. Nicephorus was driven out of his Church and banished in 814. by the Authority of Leo Armeniacus; and although under the Emperor Michael Balbus, many that were banished had Liberty to return, yet he was not allowed that Favour, but remained 14. years in Banishment, in which he died in 828. The Works which he hath left us are these that follow.

The first is a Letter written in 811. to Pope Leo III. which contains a long Confession of Faith. Baronius hath printed it in Latin in his Annals, and 'tis also printed in Greek with the Acts of the Council of Nice, and in Greek and Latin in Zonaras, and in the Collection of the Councils. In it Nicephorus speaks of himself with much Humility and Abasement; He says, that having passed the former Part of his Life at Court, and in Worldly Affairs, he had retreated into Solitude, out of which he was drawn against his Will and made Patriarch of Constantinople, that finding himself burdened with the Weight of so great a Charge, he begged the Prayers of the Bishop of Rome, and all the Faithful of his Church: He commends the Piety and Faith of the Church of Rome, but adds, that New Rome was not at all inferior to Old in the purity of her Faith. To make Proof of this Assertion, he joins a Confession of Faith to his Letter, in which, after he hath explained the Mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, and acknowledged the Invocation and Intercession of Saints, and Worship of Images, he declares, that he receives the 7. first Councils and the Doctrine of the Fathers. After this he excuses himself to the Pope, that he did not write to him sooner, and says that the Cause was, that he was made to believe that the Church of Rome was at Enmity with that of Constantinople; but now the Cause of the Division being removed, he doubted not but there would be a perfect Agreement between the two Churches. In the Conclusion he recommends to the Pope Michael the Archbishop of Philadelphia, who carried this Letter and some Presents with it. [This Letter is extant in Greek and Latin at Heidelberg, 1591. put out by Cornelius, and with Zonaras at Paris, 1620.]

Nicephorus's Abridgment of History is his most considerable Work, it begins at the Death of the Emperor Mauritius, and ends with the Reign of the Empress Irene, [ad an. 769.] It hath been published in Greek and Latin by Petavius, and printed in Latin and Greek in Octavo, 1616. and since put into the Bizantine History, Tom. 1. [It hath been since put out with Theoph. Simocitta's History, Paris 1648.]

Some attribute to him also a Chronology, which was heretofore translated by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, [into Latin, and inserted into his History:] it contains a Catalogue of all the Patriarchs, Kings, and Princes of the Jews, Kings of Persia and Macedon, Roman Emperors, according to the Order of their Successors, the Years of their Lives and Reigns, the Names of some of the Empreſſes, Kings of Israel, and Jewish High-Priests, the Names and Years of the Patriarchs of the Churches of Jerusalem, Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria

N

dria

dria and Antioch. This Work is very defective if it be *Nicephorus's*, some other Person hath added the Names of some of the Emperors, and some Patriarchs which lived after his Use and Worship of Death: At first there appeared only a Translation attributed to *Anastasius*; afterward *Camerarius* made another Version, upon which *Contius*, a Lawyer at *Bruges*, made a Comment. *Scaliger* printed it in Greek at the End of his Edition of *Eusebius's Chronicon*, [or *Thesaurus Temporum*] and last of all *F. Goar* printed them in Greek and Latin at *Paris*, 1652. with *Syncellus's Chronicon*. At the Beginning of this Work is prefixed a Book, intituled, *Schometria*, which contains a Catalogue of Canonical [Ecclesiastical] and Apocryphal Books, but 'tis not certain, that it is the Work of this Patriarch, [our Learned Bishop of *Chester*, Dr. *Pearson*, proves, that 'tis not *Nicephorus's*, but some other Author's coeval with him in his *Vind. Ignat. p. 1.*]

He made also four Treatises against the *Iconoclasts*, of which we have only a Latin Version composed by *Turrrian*, which is extant in *Canisius's Collection*, [Tom. 4. p. 253] and in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, [Tom. 14.] In the first, he supposes the *Iconoclasts* to have wrong Sentiments of the Incarnation, from whence he concludes, that they are justly condemned, because they have not followed universally the Doctrine of the General Councils, because they have demolished the Temples, beat down the Images, and treated them as Idolaters which worship them, insomuch, that they have been the Cause of the Effusion of much Christian Blood; and lastly, because they have separated themselves from the Church. In the 2d. Tract, he endeavours to prove by 10. Reasons, that the Image of Jesus Christ ought to have more Respect than the Cross. In the 3d. Book he proves the Worship of Images by the Example of the Cherubims over the Ark. In the last, he shews, That the Image of Jesus Christ may be formed and painted, because according to his Humane Nature he is bounded, and finite.

He hath also 3. Books which he terms *Antirrhethicks*, against the Council held at *Constantinople* under *Constantius Copronymus*, which abolished the Use of Images, but we have only some Fragments of this Work put out by *F. Combefis* in his 2d. Volume of his Addition to the *Biblioth. Patrum*, [at *Paris*, 1648.] Lastly, we meet with several Canons which bear the Name of *Nicephorus* among the *Greek Canonists*. *Glycas* cites 51. which proves, that he made a great number. *Cotelerius* hath published a Collection of 37. and another of 9. [inter *Monument. Eccles. Græc. Tom. 3. p. 445.*] These are the Contents of them, 1. If a Person by chance washes a Cloath consecrated to the Service of the Altar, it loseth not its Consecration. 2. A Man that hath been twice married shall do Penance two years, and he that hath been married thrice, 5. years. 3. He that remains but a small time within the Close of a Church shall not be punished for it, but he that continues long there shall suffer the Punishments in that Case provided. 4. The Gifts bestowed upon the Church by dead Men may be received, though they died intestate, if it be known that it was their Design and Intention. 5. If the

* The Week before Easter was called the Holy Week, because of the continued Devotion of it. It was also called the Great Week, *ὡς τὰ μεγάλα ἐστὶν ἀποστολὰ ἐν αὐτῇ ἀγάπη.* *Chrys. in Gen.*

Feast of the Annunciation happen upon the Thursday or Friday * in the Holy Week, the Christians might upon that Day eat Fish and drink Wine. 6. He that is consecrated an Abbot, and is a Priest, may ordain Readers and Subdeacons in his Monastery. 7. He may not ordain any Person who hath lived viciously in his Youth, although he be become a virtuous Man, because he that is consecrated to God must be without scandalous Faults. 8. Such as are born of Concubines, or of 2d. and 3d. Marriages, may be ordained. 9. The Communion may be given to a sick Person, who is near death, although he be not fasting. 10. Bending of the Knee may be used in saluting upon Sundays from the Passover to Pentecost, but the ordinary kneeling may not be used. 11. A Priest doth not sin, if he consecrate the Sacrament, or burn a Taper for 3. Persons at once. 12. He may not consecrate a Chalice in the Vestry. 13. A Priest may not consecrate the Sacrament without hot Water, unless in Case of absolute Necessity. 14. A Monk who hath left his Profession, may resume it again, without using the accustomed Prayers. 15. Religious Persons may go within the Rails of the Altar to light the Tapers, or brush the Altar. 16. Monks may not labour on Good-Friday, that they may not have a Pretence of breaking the Fast. 17. A Monk may forsake his Monastery in 3. cases, 1. If the Abbot be an Heretick. 2. If any Woman be admitted into it, or 3. If they teach the Children of Tradesmen in it. 18. Because these Youngsters will divulge the Secrets of the Monastery. 19. Monks that are put under Penances and Censures, may eat and pray with the rest, and have part of the Eulogies and consecrated Bread. 20. On the Fasts of the Apostles and St. Philip the Monks in the Monasteries shall not eat till Night, but they that labour may eat After-noon, and sup at Night. 21. If a Nun hath been forced by the Barbarians, if she hath lived an orderly and commendable Life before, she shall be discharged after 40. Days Penance,

but if she hath lived a lewd and scandalous Life, she shall undergo the Penance of an Adulteress. 22. He that hath put on the Habit of a Monk for any Temporal Ends, as to exempt himself from bearing Arms, and afterwards discovers his Hypocrisie, shall be put to Penance six score Days, and afterwards may be admitted to the Communion. 23. Young Monks, who forsake their Monastery, must not be admitted to the Communion. 24. An Abbot ought not to pull off the Cowl from the Monks, nor endeavour it. 25. A Monk that hath put off his Habit, and will not resume it, ought not to be received to the Communion. 26. If a sick Man desires Baptism, or a Monk's Habit, they ought to be given him immediately. 27. A Monk that is a Priest ought not to celebrate the Mass without his Cloak. 28. A Confessor who hath had secret Sins discovered to him, ought to keep those secret Sinners from the Communion, mildly advising them to Repentance and Prayer, and impose a suitable Penance upon them, but not prohibit them from coming into the Church, nor defame them. 29. As to Adulterers, Manslayers, and other notorious Sinners, who confess their Crimes, they must be kept from the Communion, endure a long Penance, and not be suffered to remain in the Church longer than the Prayers for the Catechumens; but if their Sins are publick, they must go through the several Degrees of Penance commanded by the Laws of the Church. 30. If a Layman do voluntarily confess his Sins, the Confessor may dispense with Part of his Penance. 31. A Priest by the Permission of his Bishop may use the Ceremonies of setting up the Cross. 32. The Sacrament may not be given to Usurers. 33. Monks must fast on Wednesday and Friday in *Quinquagesima*-week, but after they have eaten of the Fore-consecrated Elements, they ought to eat a little Cheese in opposition to the Heresie of the *Jacobites* and *Tetradites*. 34. If a Man that hath a Concubine will neither put her away nor marry her with the Blessing of the Church, his Offerings may not be received by the Church. 35. If a Monk leaves his Habit, eats Flesh, marries, and will not reform or repent, he must be excommunicated, taken by Force, and being put into his Habit, shall be shut up in his Monastery. 36. A Man that hath been guilty of Fornication ought not to be ordained. 37. Such Persons as are reputed to be Fornicators need not to be avoided, but such as are known and proved such. These are the Canons of the first Collection, and the second are these, 1. Churches consecrated by Hereticks are to be accounted no better than common Houses; and therefore, though there be singing before the Cross, yet there ought to be no Service at the Altar, burning Incense, Prayers, nor lighting of Candles and Tapers. The 2d. is about the Ceremonies in the Restoration of a Monk, who resumes his Habit which he had once left. The 3d. declares, That we ought not to receive the Sacrament from the Hands of a Priest that doth not fast on Wednesdays and Fridays. The four next are in the precedent Collection. The 8th. says, That a Priest, Deacon, or Reader, deposed, if he become a Monk, may say Grace in the Monastery. The last is the same with the 25th. of the former Collection.

Leunclacius in his Collection of the *Greek and Roman Laws*, hath published 17. Canons attributed to *Nicephorus*, which are all in the former Collection, except the 2d. which forbids travelling on Sundays, the third, which rejects some Apocryphal Books, the ninth, which forbids travelling in the Week after Easter, and singing the Hymn called *Beati Immaculati* the Saturday which is before *Quasi-modo*, the 12th. which inflicts the Penance of Manslayers upon him that strikes his Father, the 13th. which allows Monks to baptize, and the 16th. which says, That 'tis lawful for Laymen to baptize Infants when a Priest cannot be had.

After these Canons *Cotelerius* hath also printed a Canonical Letter of *Nicephorus's*, wherein he answers several Questions of Discipline propounded to him. The Questions and Answers are as follow. *Quest. 1.* Whether it be lawful to communicate, eat or sing, with those Priests which have been ordained at *Rome*, *Naples*, or in *Lombardy*, without Proclamation, or Title? He answers, Yea, if it be through Necessity, and could not be done otherwise. *Quest. 2.* Whether they ought to receive Priests ordained in *Sicily* out of the Province? He answers, Yes, for the same Reason. *Quest. 3.* Whether they may communicate with those Bishops in Prayer and Singing, who had Communion with Hereticks, and go into their Churches? He answers, No, in no wise. *Quest. 4.* Whether they may do it if the Churches be not possessed by Hereticks, but Catholick Bishops? He answers, Yes, provided that the Catholick Bishops do solemnly open, and call Assemblies in them. *Quest. 5.* Whether the Orthodox Christians may go into the Church-yards, where the Bodies of the Saints lye, and pray to them, when the Church-yards are in the Possession of Hereticks? He answers, No, unless in Case of Necessity, or to honour the Saints Relicks. *Quest. 6.* How those Monks ought to be treated who have been invested in that Habit by Hereticks? He answers, They ought to be received to Communion by an Orthodox Priest after they have done their Penance. *Quest. 7.* How those Priests and Monks are to be dealt with who have subscribed to Heresie? He answers, They ought to be received when they have done their full Penance.

About the Use and Worship of Images. Penance. *Quest.* 8. Whether they may communicate with those Monks who hold communication with Hereticks? He answers, No. *Quest.* 9. Whether they ought to be put upon Penance, who have eaten but once only with Hereticks? He answers, they ought to do Penance, and then they may be admitted with the ordinary Prayers and Ceremonies. *Quest.* 10. Whether such Laymen, as have subscribed to Heresie, and communicated with Hereticks, may eat with the Orthodox Laity? He answers, they may not, till they have done Penance. *Quest.* 11. Whether Men may be baptized by a Priest, who hath held communion with Hereticks, when they cannot have an Orthodox Priest, especially in cases of danger? He answers, it is allowable for such Priests, in case of necessity, to baptize, and administer the Sacraments, which have been consecrated by an unblameable Priest, to invest Monks, to read the Prayers at Funerals, and bless the Water at Epiphany. *Quest.* 12. Whether it be allowable to receive Schismatics? He answers, they ought to undergo Penance before they are received. *Quest.* 13. Whether a Priest, who hath been ordained by a lapsed Bishop, may exercise the Office of his Priesthood, after he hath done Penance, as a certain Priest in a Monastery now doth? He answers, There is no doubt at all but that he may not. *Quest.* 14. How they are to be dealt with who have eaten with the Patriarch of Constantinople, who is a Heretick? He answers, They may be received, as he said before, after they have underwent the Penance imposed on them, and continue in the Order wherein they were. The Penance ought to be proportioned to the Persons and their Manners, which is sufficient, if it be undergone 80. or 120. days. *Quest.* 15. May Men have Society with those, who have communicated with those Priests, who have eaten with the Patriarch, not knowing it? He answers, Their Ignorance excuses them. *Quest.* 16. Whether Orthodox Priests may impose Penance, as *Hilari- on* and *Enstatius* have done? He answers, Priests may certainly do it, and 'tis probable Monks may do it, when there is no Priest. *Quest.* 17. Whether a Monk invested by a deposed Priest, not knowing it, is rightly and sufficiently consecrated? He answers, his Ignorance makes him safe. This Letter was written by *Nicephorus*, in the place of his Exile to a Bishop of his Province, about the difficulties which then happened in communicating with the *Iconoclasts*.

Photius, who had read this History of *Nicephorus*, passes his Judgment upon it in the 66th. Vol. of his *Biblioth.* in this manner. *His Style*, saith he, *hath nothing superfluous nor obscure, neither too much affected, nor yet too careless in his Words and Expressions, but yet he uses such choice and elegant terms, as might well become a good Orator. He avoided all new fangled Words, and uses only the common and ancient expressions, and is very agreeable and pleasing. In fine, he might be said to have out-done all that ever wrote History before him, had not his desire of Brevity hindered him from using necessary Ornaments for such a Work.*

Theodor- us Studita This Judgment of *Photius* is true, as to the History of *Nicephorus*, but the same commendation may not be given to his other Works, which have nothing in them Praise-worthy but their Method and Brevity. I except his Letter to the Pope, which is of a copious, but flat Style.

Next to *Nicephorus*, *Theodorus Studita* is the most considerable of the Patrons of Image-Worship; He was the Scholar of *St. Plato*, Head of the Monastery upon *Mount Olympus*, who voluntarily resigned the Government of it to him in 795. The same year *Constantinus Copronymus* having forced his Wife to enter upon a Religious Life, married one of her Maids of Honour named *Theodora* which *Tarasius* the Patriarch was extremely against, tho' he did not oppose it with so much vigour as he ought, nor punished *Joseph*, the Monks Steward of the Church of *Constantinople*, who had married them; but *Plato* and *Theodorus* declared themselves openly against the Emperor, and separated themselves from his Communion, blaming the carriage of *Tarasius*. The greatest part of the Monks followed their example, which angered *Constantine* so much, that he banished *Theodorus* with eleven of his Monks. After the Death of this Emperor, *Theodorus* returned to *Constantinople*, but not being able to stay in his own Monastery, by reason of the Inroads of the Barbarians, he was created Abbot of the Monastery of *Studa* at *Constantinople*, which was so called from the Name of the Founder. He restored this Monastery, put in his Monks, and enjoy'd it some time peaceably. But afterwards quarrelling with the Patriarch *Nicephorus* about the restoration of *Joseph* the Steward, he was banished a second time, because he would not approve the Decision of the Synod, which declared the second Marriage of *Constantine* Lawful. In his Exile, he continued his opposition to that Allegation violently; he wrote to Pope *Leo III.* about it, and treated them that maintained it as Hereticks, calling them *Mechians*, because they approved, or at least, tolerated Adultery. And whereas some of his Friends told him, that he could not properly impute Heresie to an Opinion that only respected Manners, he on the contrary held, that his Adversaries had made a Doctrine of it, by giving a Dispensation or Indulgence to an Adulterous Match, and pronouncing them accursed who

would not acknowledge it Lawful. They produced several Precedents of Indulgences and Dispensations; in answer to which, to shew the present case to be very different from those they alledged, he wrote a Treatise of Dispensations or Indulgences. In 811. he returned from his second Exile, after the Death of the Emperor *Nicephorus*, and was reconciled to the Patriarch *Nicephorus* by the Mediation of the Emperor *Michael* and the Pope. In the Reign of *Leo*, he undertook the Defence of Image-Worship with much heat and vigour, and tho' the Emperor commanded him to be silent, yet he spake and wrote Zealously against a Synod held by that Emperor against the Worship of Images. This was the cause of his third Exile, in which he suffered much through the Cruelty of *Leo*, whom he provoked by Writing to his Fellows in his Exile, and animated them to maintain their ground. In the beginning of the Reign of *Michael Balbus*, in 821. he had Liberty given him to return to *Constantinople*, but having spoken too freely, he was forced to retire for some time. At the end of his Life, he visited the Patriarch *Nicephorus* in his Exile, and several others. He died in the Year 826. *Michael* his Scholar hath written his Life, who thus speaks of his Writings. 'He wrote, or dictated several Works, which shew, that he was enlighten'd by the Holy Spirit. The first was a Catechism, which he calls a small one, tho' it contains 135 Sermons spoken to his Brethren, proper for each day, of which the Sentences are choice, and Terms elegant. In them he treats of Constancy, contempt of Adversity, Perseverance in the Austerities and Exercises of a Monastick Life, resisting of Temptations, and Courage under all Accidents of Life, with great Eloquence. He hath also another Work called a large Catechism, divided into three parts, containing the Rules and Discipline of a Monastick Life. He hath also composed a Volume of Panegyrics, or Sermons upon the chief Festivals of the Year, as well those of our Lord, as those of the Virgin and *St. John*, whose solitary and retired Life he commends in an Hymn by it self. He hath made a Piece also in Iambick Verse, in which he describes the Creation, the Fall of the first Man, the Murder of *Cain*, the Life of *Enoch*, and of *Noah*. In the same Book also, he delivers an History of the Heresie of the *Iconoclasts*. We have five Books of his Letters, in which he manifests a great deal of freedom in his Discourse, Zeal for the Truth, Care of the Church, and Constancy in Adversity. Lastly, he hath made a Dogmatical Treatise, in which he confutes the Sophisms of the *Iconoclasts* with solid Reasons.--- Of these Works, only these are come to our hands, a Latin Version of his 134 Sermons, made by *Livineius*, Canon of *Antwerp*, and printed there by *Mireus* in 1602. The Version of several of his Letters, which *Baronius* had out of a MS. and caused them to be translated by *Sirmondus* to put into his Annals, where they may be found between the Years 795 and 826. A Sermon in Latin upon the 4th. Sunday in Lent, [which is in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 14.] A fragment of a Letter to *Naucratus* about the Hereticks, [extant in *Gr.* and *Lat.* in *Allatius de consensu*, l. 3. c. 13.] A Letter to a Monk who had left his Monastery, translated by *Turnan*. A Sermon upon *St. Bartholemew*, turned into Latin by *Dacherius* in the 3d. Tome of his *Spicilegium*. The Life of *St. Plato*, Head of the Monastery of *Mount Olympus*, published by *Surius*, December 6th. [or 16th.] Lastly, a Doctrinal Treatise about the Worship of Images, printed at *Antwerp* 1556. in *Lat.* and at *Rome* in 1553. in *Gr.* with a Treatise of *St. John Damascene* of Images. *Baronius* hath also printed the Testament or Will of this Abbot [in his Annals in 826.] which contains several profitable Admonitions and Directions for his Monks, [but chiefly a Superstitious Zeal for Image-worship. It is also printed with his Sermons at *Antwerp* in 1602. and in *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 14.] In the *Greek* Liturgies there are several Hymns, or Songs, in Honour of the Restoration of Images, attributed to him, but they are not his, being made since the Peace was restored to the *Greek* Church about that subject. *F. Sirmondus* hath published the Works of this Monk in *Greek* and *Latin* at the end of his own Works. His Works are useful for Monks. He wrote in a plain and easie Style. He died in the year 826. Nov. 11. His Life was written by his Scholar *Michael*, part of which is published in *Baronius's* Annals, [Tom. 9.] The Relation of his Death made by *Naucratus*, who was another of his Scholars, hath been published in *Greek* and *Latin* by *F. Combefis*, in Vol. 2. *Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr.* [Dr. Cave hath this Treatise in MS. and hath given us a Specimen of its trifling, and vain commendation of the Image-worshippers, and in particular of *Theodorus Studita*, in *Hist. Lit.* p. 512.]

Joseph, Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, was the Brother of *Theodorus*, and his Companion in all his troubles. He was banished with him for opposing the Marriage of *Constantinus Copronymus*; the Restoration of *Joseph* the Steward of *Constantinople*; and for so zealously maintaining Image-worship. He hath left us a Discourse in Honour of the Cross, [extant in *Gretzer de Cruce*, Tom. 2. p. 1200.] and an Epistle to *Simeon* the Monk, printed in *Baronius's* Annual in 808. p. 10. [Dr. Cave, 22.]

There was another *Theodorus* [Surnamed *Graptus*] which flourished about the same time with *Studita*, and was one of the most zealous Patrons of Image-Worship; for the Defence of which, he died in Exile and Prison. He composed the Relation of a Conference of *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, with *Leo*, published by *F. Combefis*, with a Narration of the Martyrdom of himself, and Brother *Theophanes*, who out-lived him, and was Bishop of *Nicaea*. There is attributed to him an Hymn in commendation of his Brother, which is found among the *Greek Offices*. [*Theodorus* also hath a Letter to *Jouannes Cyzicenus*, concerning his own and Brother's Sufferings from the Emperor *Theophilus*; published also by *F. Combefis*, and a Book de *fide Orthodoxa contra Iconomachos*, yet in MS.]

Theosterictus, a Monk and Scholar of *Nicetas*, a Defender of Image-Worship, wrote the Life of his Master in a Panegyrick, recited by *Metaphrastes*, [and is extant in *Surius*, April 3.] It contains an Abridgment of the Persecutions raised upon the account of Image-Worship, from the Reign of *Leo Isaurus* to that of *Michael Balbus*. These are the chief of the *Greek Authors*, which wrote in the beginning of this Age in the dispute of Images. [Besides the forementioned Authors, there were others engaged in this contest of Image-Worship, tho' of less note in the *Greek Church*, as *Sergius*, called Confessor by *Photius*, who wrote an History against the *Iconoclasts*, of which we have nothing but the Name, and the Judicious Censure of *Photius* of it, in his *Biblioth. Co.* 67. 2. *Michael* called *Syncellus*, who endured much for Image-Worship with *Theodorus Studita* and *Nicephorus*, he hath left nothing in the defence of the Cause for which he suffered, but hath two Pieces extant, viz. An Encomium of *Dionysius* the *Arcopagite*, which is among the Works of *Dionysius*, Tom. 2. And an Encomium upon the Holy Angels and Archangels of God, put out in *Greek and Latin* by *F. Combefis* in his *Auctuar.* Nov. Tom. 1. p. 1525.]

Claudius Archbishop of *Turin*, besides the Treatise of Images, of which we have already spoke, hath composed several other Works. We have a Comment of his upon the Epistle of *St. Paul* to the *Galatians*, printed at *Paris* in 1542. and inserted into the *Biblioth. Patrum*, [Tom. 14. p. 134.] Two Prefaces put out by *F. Mabillon* in *Analec.* Tome 1. of which the first is to his Commentaries on *Leviticus*, and the other to those of his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. *Trithemius* makes mention of several other Commentaries of this Author upon many other Books of the Bible viz. The *Pentateuch*, *Joshua*, *Judges*, *Ruth*, and all *St. Paul's Epistles*. His Comment upon *Leviticus* is in MS. in the Library of *St. German de Prez*. His Comment upon the Gospel of *St. Matthew* is in MS. in the *Jesuits College* at *Paris*, and in the Library at the Cathedral Church of *Laon*. His Comments upon *St. Paul's Epistle* to the *Romans*, and 2d. to the *Corinthians*, are in the *French King's Library*. That upon the Epistle to the *Ephesians* is in the Library of the Abby of *Fleury*, and upon *Ruth* in the Abby of *Good-Hope*. *F. Labbe* hath published a short Chronicon attributed to this Author. Altho' *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans* makes no great account of this Author's Commentaries, yet we may truly say, that in his Comment upon the *Galatians*, he explains the literal Sense in a familiar and easy manner, agreeing with the true Sense of the Apostle, without mixing any Allegories, and invented Senses far from the Subject. *Jonas* of *Orleans*, and *Dungal* accuse him of reviving not only the Errors of *Eustathius*, and *Vigilantius*, touching the Relicks and Honour of the Saints, and that of *Felix Orgelitanus* about the Incarnation, but also that of *Arius* about the Trinity; yet *Jonas* owns, that it doth not appear by his Writings, but that he received it from Persons worthy of Credit.

Dungal, besides his Treatise against *Claudius* of *Turin*, hath a Letter directed to the Emperor *Charles the Great*, about two Eclipses in the Year 810. 'Tis extant in the 10th. Tome of *Dacherius's Spicilegium*.

C H A P. II.

A Relation of the Dispute concerning Grace and Predestination.

Of Grace and Predestination. **O**F all the Questions that were debated in the ninth Age, there was none that was managed with more heat and noise, than this of Predestination and Grace. *Gottschalcus*, a *German* Born, was the first Broacher of it. He was brought up and instructed in the Monastery of *Augia* [the Rich] or *Richenou*, and was Surnamed *Fulgentius*. He made Profession of a Monastick Life in the Monastery of *Orbez* in the Diocese of *Soissons*, and was ordained Priest at forty years of Age, not by his own Bishop, but by *Rigboldus*, Suffragan of the Church of *Rheims*, which made his Ordination to be suspected. *Hincmarus* describes him to us as an ill-bred, turbulent, and fickle Man, and assures us, that this was the Sense which the Abbot and Monks of his own Monastery had of him. Nevertheless, they could not but say he was an Ingenious, Studious, and Subtle Man, but very troublesome and overreaching.

About the Year 846, he had a mind to leave his Monastery, (*Hincmarus* accuses him of doing it without the leave, or consent of his Abbot) and go to *Rome* to visit the Holy Places there. From thence he went into *Dalmatia* and *Pannonia*, where, some say, under a pretence of Preaching the Gospel to the Infidels, he began to spread his Doctrine of Predestination. But however this was, at his return he tarried some time in *Lombardy*, in an Hospital founded by Count *Eberard*, and had a Conference in 847, with *Notingus* Bishop of *Vienna*, concerning the Predestination of the Saints to Glory, and of the Wicked to Damnation. *Notingus* offended at this Opinion of *Gottschalcus* not long after being come to meet *Lewis* King of *Germany* at a Town of *Switzerland*, told *Rabanus* Archbishop of *Mentz*, who promised him to confute this Error of *Gottschalcus* in Writing, by the Authorities both of Holy Scriptures and Fathers, which Promise he not long after performed in a Treatise, which he sent with two Letters, one to *Notingus*, and the other to Count *Eberard*, both against the Error of *Gottschalcus*. In his Treatise he accuses this Monk of teaching that Predestination is so made, that every Man, that is predestinated to Life, can't be damn'd; and every Man predestinated to Damnation can't be sav'd. He chiefly opposeth this last Assertion, and shews, that such a Predestination is contrary to the Goodness and Justice of God, who desires the Salvation of all Men, because nothing is more unjust than to damn a Man who can't avoid Sin. He owns that Predestination is asserted in Holy Scripture, but in this Sense, that all Men being fallen by the Sin of the first Man into a State of Damnation, can't be delivered but by the Grace of *Jesus Christ*, who was provided, and predestined from all Eternity. That those, who are freed from the State of Damnation, and to whom both their Original and Actual Sins are pardoned by

Baptism, are afterwards damned for the Sins that they commit wilfully and freely; and that it is by the foresight of their Evil Will, that they have been predestined; But that the Predestination of God, whether to Good or Evil, hath no influence upon Man to necessitate him either way. That God predestines things only, because he foresees after what manner they will happen. That he doth not predestine Evil, but foresees it only, whereas he both foresees and predestines Good. That out of the whole Mass of Mankind, he through meer Grace, accepts those, whom he pleaseth, to Salvation, and leaves others, yet not ordaining them to Damnation, but for their Sins, which he foresees they will commit freely. These are the Doctrines which *Rabanus* lays down against *Gottschalcus* in his Treatise to *Notingus*, which he endeavours to prove by Texts of Scripture, and Testimonies of *St. Austine*, *Fulgentius*, and *Gennadius*, whose Book concerning the Doctrines of the Church, he cites under the Name of *St. Austine*. He repeats the same thing in his Letter to *Eberard*, and exhorts that Lord not to suffer any contrary Doctrine to be taught in his Dominions. [This Treatise and Letters are printed alone at *Paris*, 1647. by the care of *Sirmondus*.]

Gottschalcus seeing himself thus attacked by an Adversary of great Credit and Authority, resolved to set himself about the Explication of his Opinion, that he might make him understand his true Meaning, and rectify his Mistake concerning him. Wherefore he went into *Germany* in the beginning of the Year 848, and finding that the difference between himself and *Rabanus* might be reduced to three Questions, 1. Concerning the Predestination of the Wicked; 2. Concerning the Will and Death of *Jesus Christ* to save all Men, even Infidels themselves; and 3. Concerning Free-will; he composed a Treatise, in which he opposes the Opinion of *Rabanus* under these three Heads. He reproves him for asserting, that the Reprobate are not predestined to Damnation. He maintains, that God foreseeing that they would live and die in Sin, hath predestined them to Eternal Torments. Concerning the 2d. Article he says, that we must understand that Text of Scripture, *God will have all Men to be saved*, of those that are actually and effectually saved, because there is none that God will have to be saved but shall be saved; and that *Jesus Christ* hath not poured out his Blood to redeem those that are finally and eternally reprobated, but only for the Elect. Upon the 3d. Question, which concerns Free-will, he reproves *Rabanus* for taking up the Opinion of *Gennadius*, the Scholar of that unfortunate Man *Cassian*, instead of *St. Austine's*. We have not this Treatise of *Gottschalcus*, but some Fragments of it cited by *Hincmarus*. *Gottschalcus* propounded these three Questions to the most able Men of his time, praying them to resolve

Of Grace and Predestination. solve them agreeably to the Doctrine of St. *Austine*. He wrote particularly to *Lupus Servatus*, *Marcellus* Abbot of *Prumfers*, and one named *Jonas*.

The Council of Mentz against Gottschalkus. In October 848, there was a Council held at *Mentz*, in which *Gottschalkus* was accused by *Rabanus*. *Gottschalkus* presented a Confession of his Faith, in which he declared, that he owned and believed before God, and his Saints, that there were two sorts of Predestination. The one of the Elect to Eternal Happiness, and the other of the Reprobate to Damnation, because as God hath immutably predestined the Elect before the Creation of the World through his free Mercy to Life Eternal, in like manner hath he immutably predestined the Reprobate for their wicked Actions to Eternal Death. This expression shews plainly, what was the state of the Question between *Gottschalkus* and *Rabanus*. *Rabanus* accuses him for believing, that God predestined men to Damnation, without any prevision of their wicked Works. *Gottschalkus* in this Confession of Faith owns, that no Man is predestined to Damnation but for his Crimes. *Propter ipsorum mala Merita*. *Rabanus* acknowledges, that God knows those, that are in a state of Sin, and hath decreed to punish them with Eternal Death, because of their Sins; but he will not call it Predestination to Death, lest Men should think God also predestines them to Sin. And *Gottschalkus* resolutely maintained, that there was a Predestination to Death as well as to Life. They both agreed, that Predestination to Life was free and gratuitous; that God hath chosen, whom he pleaseth, out of the Corrupt Mass of Mankind, to Salvation, and through meer Mercy, and fits them for Salvation by his Graces, and all other necessary means for that end; as also they both confess, that God deals after the same manner with the Reprobate, whom he condemns to Eternal Death only for their Sins, of which he is no manner of cause. But *Rabanus* would by no means allow this last Decree, Predestination to Evil, and *Gottschalkus* stiffly maintained it. The Bishops of this Synod not being able to persuade him to change his Opinion, or way of speaking, condemned him; and knowing that he was a Monk of the Diocese of *Soissons*, which was subject to the Archbishop of *Rheims*, where he was ordain'd, they sent him to *Hincmarus*, to whom *Rabanus* wrote in these words. *Ye know, that a certain Vagabond Monk named Gottschalkus, who says that he was ordain'd Priest in your Diocese, being come from Italy to Mentz, is found to teach a wicked and pernicious Doctrine concerning Predestination, maintaining that as there is a Predestination of God for the Good, so there is also for the Evil; and that there are many Persons in the World that can't return from their Errors, nor turn from their Sins, because of the Predestination of God, which constrains them to suffer their Death, to which they are determin'd, being in their own Nature incorrigible, and worthy of Damnation. This Man being known to maintain this Doctrine in the Council lately held at Mentz, and being found incorrigible, we have thought fit, according to the Order and Advice of our most Pious King Lewis, to send him to you, after we had condemn'd him and his pernicious Doctrine, that you may keep him within your Diocese, out of which he is gone contrary to the Canons. Do not suffer him to teach his Errors any longer, nor seduce the People; for I perceive, he hath already seduced several Persons, who are become less careful of their Salvation, since he hath put this Opinion into their Minds, saying in them, Why should I labour for my Salvation? If I am predestin'd to Damnation I can't avoid it; and on the contrary, whatever Sins I am guilty of, if I am predestin'd to Salvation I shall be certainly saved. Thus have I, in a few words, shewed you his Doctrine, which you may better, and more fully understand, from his own Mouth, and act according as you think fit against him.* [This Epistle is also printed by *Sirmondus* at *Paris*, 1647.]

The Life of Hincmarus. *Hincmarus* was descended of a Noble Family in France, and brought up in the Monastery of *St. Denys* [near *Paris*] where he wore a Canon's Habit, according to the Custom of the Monks of that Monastery. Being come from it, he was a long time at the Court of *Lewis the Kind*, but returned again to the Monastery of *St. Denys*, after it was reformed by *Hilduin* in the year 829 [then Abbot of it.] He accompanied him into *Saxony*, whither he was banished, but did not abet the Faction of *Lotharius* with him, but, on the contrary, continued faithful to *Lewis the Kind*. When this Prince was restored, *Hincmarus*, who had a disposition very proper for such Affairs, abode at Court to serve the King and Bishops about Ecclesiastical Matters. After some time spent thus about Worldly Matters, he returned again to his Retirement in the Monastery, but he staid not long there, for in May 844, he was chosen Archbishop of *Rheims*, ten years after the Deposition of *Ebbo*, in whose place *Fulcus* was put, and presided almost nine years in it, and was succeeded by *Noro*, who held the See but a year and half. He was consecrated in a Synod of Archbishops and Bishops held at *Beauvais*, after he was desired by the Clergy and People of the Metropolis of *Rheims*, with the consent of the Abbots, and Monks of his Monastery. A year after his Ordination, the Emperor *Lotharius*, who favoured *Ebbo*, (who was deposed merely because he had put *Lewis the Kind* to Penance) and hated *Hincmarus*,

whom he looked upon to be wholly for *Charles the Bald*, King of France, endeavoured to revoke the Sentence passed upon *Ebbo*, and restore him, supposing, that some did not acknowledge *Hincmarus* to be their Lawful Bishop of *Rheims*. To this end he wrote to the Pope, and obtain'd a Letter from him, wherein he gave *Gonbaldus*, Archbishop of *Rouen*, Commission to examine this Affair with such Bishops of the Kingdom as he should think fit to choose; who should meet at *Treves*, and having cited *Hincmarus*, examine him before the Pope's Legates, who should be present. After Easter, *Hincmarus* went to the Council, and waited for the Pope's Legates till the time appointed. After this, *Gonbaldus* summoned *Ebbo*, who not daring to appear, left *Hincmarus* in quiet possession of the Archbishoprick of *Rheims*. He governed that Church almost thirty years, for he died not till Dec. 21. 882. He had a great share in all the Affairs which were transacted in that time in the Church of France, and as to his own particular, had no small difficulties to extricate himself out of, in which he shewed a great deal of Wit, Diligence and Courage. Being endued with these Qualities, he was pleased to meet with so good an occasion of signalizing himself by the Condemnation of *Gottschalkus*; he first heard him himself, and resolved with himself to present him before the Council of Bishops, that was to meet with the Parliament appointed by *Charles the Bald* at *Quiercy*, which was the King's Palace in the Diocese of *Rheims*. And that things might be done in the better order, he gave *Rhotadus* notice of it, to be present there, because he was the properest Judge of *Gottschalkus*. *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens* was present with *Hincmarus*, and eleven other Bishops, among whom were *Rhotadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, two Suffragan Bishops, of whom *Rigboldus*, who ordain'd *Gottschalkus*, was one, and three Abbots, viz. *Paschasius Rathbertus* Abbot of *Corby*, *Bavo* Abbot of the Monastery of *Orbez*, where *Gottschalkus* was a Monk, and *Hilduinus* Abbot of *Hautevilliers*. *Gottschalkus* having been questioned in their presence, and maintained the same Opinions which he had done at *Mentz* with the same obstinacy and incorrigibleness, casting some reflections upon his Enemies, was condemned for an Heretick, degraded from his Priesthood, which he had received from *Rigboldus* Suffragan of *Rheims*, without the knowledge of his Bishop; and moreover, for his obstinacy, was condemned, according to the Laws, Canons of the Council of *Agatha*, [Can. 38.] and Constitutions of *St. Bennet*, to be beaten with Rods, and imprisoned, as the Bishops of Germany had before ordered. *Hincmarus* fearing that *Rhotadus* had not power enough to see this Sentence executed, and so he might escape; took care to shut him up in a Monastery of his Diocese. The Judgment passed against *Gottschalkus* was delivered in these Words.

Brother *Gottschalkus*, know that thou art deprived of the sacred Office of Priesthood, which if thou hast ever received, thou hast managed contrary to all Rules, and profaned, to this day, by thy Manners, disorderly Actions, and corrupt Doctrines; And that by the Judgment of the Holy Spirit, of whose Grace the Priesthood is a special Gift, and by the Vertue of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, thou art utterly forbidden to officiate in any Office of it for the future. Moreover, because thou hast intermeddled with Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs, contrary to the Profession and Duty of a Monk, and in contempt of the Ecclesiastical Laws, we do, by Vertue of our Episcopal Authority, order and command, that according to the Rules of the Church, thou be severely scourged, and afterwards shut up in a close Prison; And that thou may never teach again to infect others, we enjoin thee perpetual silence in the Name of the Eternal Word. Thus was *Gottschalkus* condemned in the presence, and with the consent of his Bishop, Abbot, him that ordain'd him, and of those who were well affected to the Doctrine of *St. Austine*, which shews that he had an injury.

This Sentence, which was pronounced against him, was executed with the utmost severity, for he was whipped in the presence of the Emperor *Charles*, and the Bishops, till he cast out of his own Hand, into the Fire, a Book, where-in he made a Collection of such Texts of Scripture, and joined Testimonies of the Fathers, as proved his Opinion; after which he was kept close Prisoner in the Monastery of *Hautevilliers* in the Diocese of *Rheims*. Nevertheless, *Hincmarus*, that he might induce him to change his Opinion, sent him a Writing, in which he explained those places of the Fathers on which he grounded it, and proved, that God indeed knows them that shall be reprobated for their Sins, but hath predestinated no Man to Evil; and that his Prescience is not the cause of any Man's ruin. He sent him also a second Instruction, but could not remove him from it.

Hincmarus also wrote to *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, an Account of what had passed in the Judgment given against him, and consulted that Bishop what he ought to do in case *Gottschalkus* should continue obstinate, whether he should deprive him of the use of Divine Service and the Communion. What answer *Prudentius* gave to these Questions is not known, but about the same time *Gottschalkus* composed two Confessions of Faith, one more long, in which he confesseth, that God hath not predestinated any Man to Sin,

Of Grace
and Pre-
destinati-
on.

Sin, or Evil, but to Good only, which is of two sorts, viz. The Rewards of his Favour, and the Effects of his Justice; That he hath freely predestinated his Elect to Life Eternal, and also hath predestinated the Devils and Reprobates to Eternal Death. He grounds this Doctrine upon Consequences taken from Holy Scripture, and Assertions of the Fathers, chiefly of St. *Austine*, *Gregory*, *Fulgentius*, and *Isidore*. That this Predestination is but one in it self, though it hath respect to two Objects, as Charity towards God and our Neighbour is the same Charity in two parts. To prove himself no Heretick, he brings a Definition of an Heretick out of St. *Cassiodorus*, viz. He is a Person, saith this Author, who either out of Ignorance, or Contempt of the Law of God, defends a new Error, or follows an old one. He affirms, that he holds nothing but what is agreeable to the Doctrine of Holy Scripture and the Ancients; and consequently, the Definition of an Heretick doth not touch him. He doubts not but he can prove the Truth of his Doctrine in an Ecclesiastical Assembly, if he could be so happy as to have the liberty given him, not only by his Discourses, but also by casting himself into scalding Water, Pitch, or flaming Oyl, without suffering any harm. He explains himself more clearly in his shorter Confession of Faith, declaring, that God hath not predestinated the Devils, and Wicked Men to Damnation, but for their Sins, which he foresees that they will commit. [These two Confessions are published by Bishop *Usher*, in his History of *Gottschalcus*. Dublin, 1631. Hanov. 1662].

† Or Ber-
tram.

The Wri-
tings of
Hincma-
rus, Ber-
tram and
Rabanus,
about Pre-
destinati-
on.

Hincmarus also wrote a Treatise in defence of his Opinion, to the Monks and Recluses of his own Diocese, against the Opinion of *Gottschalcus*. † *Ratramnus* a Monk of *Corby*, finding some things in it that deserved a Confutation, wrote a Letter against that Treatise. *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes* wrote also a Book, in which he explains his Sense of the Questions of his time, and sent it with a Letter, which served instead of a Preface to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Reims*, and *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*. He attributes much to the Authority of St. *Austine* in these Matters, and in the body of his Book, he sets down a Collection of several passages to that purpose out of him and other Fathers. He doth not disagree from *Gottschalcus*'s Opinion concerning Predestination, declaring notwithstanding, that God is not the Author of Sin, and that he damns no body but for their Crimes, which deserve so great a punishment. He follows also the Principles of St. *Austine* about Grace, Free-will, and God's Will to save all Men. This Writing was sent to *Hincmarus* and *Pardulus*, after the Council held at *Paris* about the end of the year 849, in which this Matter was mentioned, but not debated, or determined in a full Council; nevertheless the part, which the Bishops began then to abet, made it so famous, that *Charles the Bald* being at *Bourges* on his return from the Siege of *Thoulouse*, would have it cleared, and gave Order to *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferrara*, and *Ratramnus* Monk of *Corby*, to write upon that Subject. *Hincmarus*, for his part, wrote about it toward *Easter* in 850, to *Rabanus* Archbishop of *Mentz*, who had engaged in this Contest. He sent him the Treatise which he had written to the Monks of his Diocese against *Gottschalcus*, with the Writings of some other Authors, which seemed to favour him, and among them the Books of *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*. *Rabanus* having seen them, would not undertake to answer the Testimonies alledged by that Bishop, but collected some Texts of Scripture, and Sayings of the Fathers, about Predestination, to prove that the Word *Predestination* was never taken in an ill Sense; That God inclines no Man to Evil; That He is not the Author of our Damnation; That he doth not in a proper sense harden the Heart of a Man, but only permits it to be hardened, either by his own sinful actions, or by the malice of the Devil; That he made not Death; That he repents not for the Destruction of the Angels; That he would have all men to be saved. In the conclusion, he advises *Hincmarus* to hinder men from debating such sort of Questions, which may cause much scandal among the Faithful, and not to suffer *Gottschalcus* either to write or teach. He wonders that that Monk should be allowed to write, who is culpable both in Practice and Doctrine. He advises him to suffer him no longer to write, or dispute for the future, till he hath retracted, and much disapproves of their letting him enjoy Communion. He accuses him of Obstinacy and Pride, and looks upon him as incorrigible. He reproves him for wishing that he might pass through Vessels of scalding Water, Pitch, or flaming Oyl, and says he never heard the like; That it was to tempt God; That he could not endure that punishment if it were ordained for him, and therefore 'tis a great piece of presumption to wish for it, and desire it.

Lupus's
Treatise
upon the
three
Questions.

Nevertheless *Lupus Servatus*, which I do not believe to be a different Person from the Abbot of *Ferrara*, who was consulted about the Questions of the Times, 1. by *Gottschalcus*; 2. By *Hincmarus*; and lastly, by *Charles the Bald*; made a Book to clear the three Questions which *Gottschalcus* had propounded to the Council of *Mentz*, about Free-will, Predestination to Evil, and about the Death of Jesus Christ for all men; in which Treatise he lays down, and

proves these Principles and Doctrines; That God, who only is immutable, hath made Spiritual Creatures subject to change, who may do either Good or Evil. This appears in the Fall of the Angels, who being created Good, fell into Sin by the depravation of their Nature, whereas others of them adhering voluntarily to God, have received this as the Reward of their Fidelity, That they can't fall from their Happiness. That Man who is compounded of a Material Body and Spiritual Soul, was created in a State of Happiness, exempted from Death, and perfectly free; That he could do good by making use of the assistance of God's Grace, and sin by abandoning of it, but having sinned freely, he is under an unavoidable necessity of Dying, and subject to the irregular Motions of Concupiscence. That the whole Nature of Man hath been corrupted by the Sin of the first Man, and all descended of him are fallen with him. That Men have some sort of freedom, but can't choose that which is good but by the assistance of the Grace of Jesus Christ. That our Liberty only inclines us to Evil, and so we may ruin our selves, but no Man can save himself, or free himself from the power of Sin, but by the help of Jesus Christ. That they that are damned, are so by Gods Justice; and they that are saved, are so by his gracious Mercy, because by the Sin of the first Man, we all deserve Damnation, and that no Man could escape it, if God did not save him through pure Mercy; tho' we must not enquire, why God shews Mercy on some and not on others; that he could do so to all, but it is his good Pleasure to save some, and leave others in the Mass of Perdition: That when he says in Scripture that he will have all Men to be saved, it ought to be understood only of those that are actually saved. That the Word *All* is capable of exceptions, and may mean all sorts of Men; That Predestination is gratuitous, and not upon the account of our Merits. That it is in pursuance of this Election, that God gives his Grace to some, by which they are able and sedulous to do good, and leaves others to their corrupt wills by not assisting them. That he is not the Author of the Evil Men do, but Man ought to impute it to himself, or rather to the Devil, who leads him into it. That God foresees both good and evil, but he predestines nothing but the good, that he only suffers the evil and punisheth it; That what God hath predestined shall infallibly fall out, but that his Predestination imposeth no necessity; That no Christian ought to think himself of the number of the Reprobate, Men ought to labour to live well, that their punishment may be the less. He passes over slightly the Question about Predestination to Damnation. He confesses that he meets not with that Word used in that Sense in Holy Scripture, and that the great Lights of the Church abhor that expression, for fear Men should think God hath made his Creatures to punish them, and that he unjustly condemns Persons, who have no Power to avoid Sin or Damnation. That nevertheless it happens, that as God hath ordained the punishments which are consequent upon the Sin of the First Man, so he hath ordained the punishment of Sinners, yet so as they themselves are the Authors of their own Damnation. That since Men agree in the Matter, they should not quarrel about the Words and Expressions, seeking to get an unprofitable Victory. Lastly, he passeth to the 3d. Question concerning the Extent of the Redemption of Jesus Christ, which he calls the Measure of his Blood. He sets down and approves of the Expressions of Scripture, which import, that Jesus Christ died for all Men, and hath redeemed all, but he says, that they ought to be understood as he hath explained them, in which it is said, He will have all Men to be saved. He adds, that it may be said as a probability, that he died for all, that are in his Church, and receive the Sacraments, whether they be in the number of the Elect, or Reprobate. He says, that some Men condemn this Opinion of Blasphemy; that he himself should be of that Judgment, and should believe that God punishes some of the Reprobate the less for the Merits of Jesus Christ, but that the Apostle speaking of the Merits of Jesus Christ, that they are of no worth to those that are circumcised, it seems reasonable to believe that the Death of Jesus Christ is of no worth to those that are indeed baptized, but relapse and die in their Sins and Infidelity; That nevertheless, that he may not render himself odious to them who hold that Jesus Christ died not only for the Good, but also for Sinners, he sets down a Passage of St. *Chrysostome*, which seems to favour that Opinion, and may unite all divided Minds about that Matter. *Jesus Christ*, saith that Excellent Bishop, by his Doctrine and Holiness died for all, not only for the Faithful, but all the World, if all do not believe he hath done whatever was requisite on his part to save them. After these Remarks *Lupus* concludes, leaving every one to their liberty to choose what Opinion they judge truest. He confirms his Opinion, which he laid down in this Treatise, by a Collection of Passages out of St. *Austine*, St. *Jerome*, and some others of the Fathers upon these three Questions. [This Treatise of *Lupus* is extant, printed by *Sirmondus* in Holland, 1648, and 1650, and with the rest of his Works at *Paris*, 1664.]

After *Lupus* had composed this Tract, he sent a Letter to *Hincmarus* and *Pardulus*, which contained an Abridgment of his

Of Grace
and Pre-
destinati-
on.

Letter to
*Hincma-
rus* and
Pardulus

ment of his Doctrine. In it he says, that the truest Opinion is, that Predestination in regard to the Elect is a Preparative Grace, and in respect to the Wicked is a withdrawing of the same Grace; that all Men are born in a State of Damnation, and God takes such out of that State, as he pleaseth by his Mercy, and leaves others in it by his Justice. So that it is true that God predestines those he hardens, not by impelling them into Sin, but by not keeping them from it; That this Predestination doth necessitate neither the Good nor Evil, because both have a Freedom of Will, which excludes a fatal Necessity; that the Elect, who receive from God the Power to will and to do, do freely perform all that conduceth to their Salvation, and the Reprobate who are forsaken by God, do voluntarily, and not against their Wills, those Actions which deserve Eternal Punishment; that no Man is so silly, as to say, that there is a Necessity, where the Will hath a Command, although it be assisted by the Grace of God, or left by his just Judgment. But as to Infants, who dye before they come to the Use of Reason, it cannot be said that their Will hath a Part in their Salvation, or Damnation, because they are either saved by the Grace of Baptism, or damned by the Sin of the first Man. [This Letter is among his Epistles printed by Massonus at Paris, 1588. and in the forementioned Edition of all his Works.]

Lupus's
Letter to
Charles
the Bald.

It is easie to see, that this Author, although he was of St. *Austine's* Judgment, yet manages his Expressions so warily, that he may offend neither side, but bring them to an Agreement, but it happened to him, as it ordinarily does to them that are Mediators for Peace, though they carry themselves never so wisely and cautiously, and have often Reason on their side, they are disliked by both Parties at Variance. *Gottschalkus*, a very rough and severe Man, blamed the Mildness which *Lupus Servatus* had used, and the moderate Expressions which he had brought. That Man, saith he, in a Letter written to *Ratramnus*, is so cautious and moderate, and hath so cunningly answered the 3. Questions of which he speaks in his Book, that he agrees not thoroughly with either Party. *Hincmarus* and *Pardulus* were not better satisfied, but accused him of Opinions unworthy of the Mercy and Goodness of God, which forced him to write his Letter to *Charles the Bald*, to explain his Judgment more clearly in that Dispute. It contains an Abridgment of his former Treatise concerning the Fall of all Men in *Adam*, concerning the Election which God is pleased to make of some; concerning Predestination and Reprobation; concerning the Assistance which God is pleased to give Men through his mere Mercy; concerning the just Desertion of the Wicked; concerning the Loss of Man's Free-will to do Good; concerning the Efficaciousness of Grace, and the Death of Jesus Christ for all Men. Which last Article he explains more largely, for after he hath cited some Passages of St. *Austine* to prove, that when he says, that Christ died for all Men, he ought to be understood of those only that are saved; he opposeth the Saying of St. *Chrysostome*, against them, but we must observe, that he is not of his Judgment, by taking notice, that he saith with all due Respect to him, that he did not well understand that Place of Scripture, and that he hath not proved his Opinion by any Testimony. Lastly, he rejects the Authority of *Faustus*, as a Bishop who was in an Error, and says, that we must keep to the Judgment of St. *Austine*, St. *Jerome*, and other Fathers, commended by Pope *Gelasius*, and advises the Emperor to call a Council of Learned Men about these Questions, who may examine whether he speaks Reason, or no. [This Letter is also extant in the fore-mentioned Editions of his Works.]

Ratram-
nus or Ber-
tramus's
Treatise a-
bout Pre-
destination.

At the same time *Ratramnus*, a Monk of *Corby*, who had also been consulted by the Emperor about these famous Questions, composed a Treatise of Predestination divided into two Books. The first contains a Collection of Passages out of the Fathers, that all that is done in this World, is done by the Order and Direction of God's Providence. That although he be not indeed the Cause of the Crimes, and Sins of Wicked Men, yet they are also subject to the Order of Providence, and serve for the Execution of his Will. That God hath foreseen from all Eternity what shall befall the Good and Evil, the Elect and Reprobate. That the Predestination of the Saints is the Effect of his Mercy, and the Number of the Elect can neither be increased, nor diminished, nor altered. That all the holy Thoughts and good Actions of the Saints, by which they acquire themselves Happiness, are the Effect of the mere Grace of God. That our Free-will is too weak to do any good, unless it be strengthened by the Grace of God, which helps us to do good. That this Grace operates in us to will and to do, and that it is necessary for the Beginning of Faith and Prayer. In the second he treats of the Predestination of Sinners, and speaks by the by of the Predestination of the Elect. He shews by the Testimonies of St. *Austine*, *Fulgentius*, and other Fathers, that God hath not predestined Sinners to Sin, but to the Punishment of their Sins, and eternal Torments. He rejects the Distinction of those who say, That eternal Punishment was ordained and appointed for Sinners, but they

were not predestined to it. He maintains that this Predestination did not impose a Necessity of Sinning upon any Man, though those that are elected by the mere Mercy of God, shall be infallibly saved; and those whom God leaves in the Mass of Perdition, shall be infallibly damned for their Sins which they voluntarily commit. He adds, that we ought to attribute all the Good we do to God, and all the Evil we do to our selves, because God never inclines us to do evil, but only leaves us to the Motions of our Wills. At the End of these Books *Ratramnus* prays the Emperor not to publish them, before these Questions be fully examined and cleared, that they might know which Opinion to follow. He adds, That if this Book displeaseth the Emperor, that he would correct it, or shew him what Corrections he would have made in it, [This Treatise is published by *Manguinus* in *Collect. Script. Tom. 1. p. 29.* and in *Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 15. p. 442.*]

The Emperor gave these two Books of *Lupus* and *Ratramnus*, to *Hincmarus* and *Pardulus* to examine them, who opposed them to *Amalarius*, a Deacon of *Treves*, and *Joannes Erigina Scotus*, whom they had ordered to write upon this Subject. We have not the Work of *Amalarius*, but only that of *Joannes Scotus*, which, according to the Genius of that Author, is full of Scholastick Subtleties and Distinctions. He begins with this Position, That every Question may be resolved by four general Rules of Philosophy, viz. Division, Definition, Demonstration, and Analysis, and the rest of his Work is not less Logical, for although he cites several Passages of St. *Austine*, yet he chiefly proves his Assertions by Scholastical Reasons and Arguments. He rejects the double Predestination, and proves that Predestination doth not impose any Necessity. He maintains, That Man is absolutely free after the Sin of *Adam*, and that although he cannot do Good without the Grace of Jesus Christ, yet he doth it without being constrained to it, or forced by the Will of God, by his own free Choice. He adds, that Sin, and the Consequence of it, the Punishments with which it is rewarded, being mere Privations, are neither foreseen nor predestined by God. That Predestination hath no Place but in those things which God hath pre-ordered in order to Eternal Happiness, and supposeth, that this Predestination ariseth from the Foresight of the good Use of our Free-will. To prove what he had asserted, That Eternal Punishments are mere Privations, he affirms, That the Torments of the Damned are nothing but Privations of Happiness, or the Trouble of being deprived of it; so that according to him Material Fire is no Part of the Damned's Torments. That there is no other Fire prepared for them but the fourth Element, through which the Bodies of all Men must pass, but that the Bodies of the Elect are changed into an *Aethereal* Nature, and are not subject to the Power of Fire, whereas on the contrary the Bodies of the Wicked are changed into Air, and suffer Torments by the Fire because of their contrary Qualities; and for this Reason 'tis that the Demons, who had a Body of an *Aethereal* Nature, were massed with a Body of Air, that they may feel the Fire. Thus did Philosophy lead this Author to many wild and extravagant Notions and Opinions. [This Piece is put out by *Manguinus* in his *Vind. Predest. & Gratia. Tom. 1. p. 103.*]

Wembo or *Ganelo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, having read this Work, gathered out of it several Propositions, which he put under 19. Heads, according to the Number and Order of the Chapters of *Scotus's* Work, and sent them to *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, who having read them, found, as he thought, not only the Errors of *Pelagius* in them, but also the Impiety of the *Collyridians*. Whereupon he composed a Book to confute him, in the Preface of which he accuses *John Scotus* of following of *Pelagius*, *Celestius*, and *Julian*, to resist the Grace of Jesus Christ, and the Justice of God, to deny Original Sin, and many other Blaspheinous Doctrines. Yet *John Scotus* did not deny Original Sin, and acknowledged the Necessity of Grace in his Work, but *Prudentius* thought he found such Principles in it, as seemed to abet the Doctrine of *Pelagius*. *Prudentius* answered *John Scotus's* Book Chapter by Chapter, and opposed the Judgment and Authority of the Fathers to his false Reasonings. [The 19. Heads gathered out of *Scotus's* Book, are printed in Bishop *Usher's* History of *Gottschalkus*, chap. 19.]

Pruden-
tius's Work
against
Scotus's

After he hath rejected his Method of deciding all things, by the four Rules of Logick, and shew'd, that Questions of Divinity are not so to be handled, he confutes *Scotus's* Opinion of Predestination, Free-will, and the Punishment of the Damned, and proves the contrary Opinion. He distinguishes Predestination from Prescience, and shews that Prescience extends to Sin, but not Predestination. He distinguishes Predestination into two Sorts, the one by which God hath freely predestined the Elect to Grace and Glory, the other by which he hath destined the Wicked, whose Sins he foresees, to Eternal Damnation. He proves that Man, since the Fall, hath not a full Liberty and Power to do Good, and that he cannot do it, not only without the Grace of Jesus Christ, but that his Grace excites, impels, and enables him to do it. He maintains, that no Man affirms that

Of Grace
and Pre-
destinati-
on.

Grace wholly destroys Free-will, or that Predestination imposes any Necessity upon Men, but he observes, that Free-will is nothing else but a voluntary Choice, and unconstrained acting of the Mind. He, in the last place, decides the extravagant Opinions of *Scotus* about the Torments of the Damned, and propounds the Doctrine of the Church and Fathers, who acknowledge, that Damnation consists not only in the Privation of Happiness, but Tortures of Fire. [This Confutation of *Scotus's* Book by *Prudentius* is extant in *Mauguin's Vindic. Gratiae*, Tom. 2. p. 191. and some Parts of it are in Bishop *Usher's* Hist. of Gott. c. 8. & 11.]

Florus's
Writings
against
Scotus.

The same Extracts of *Scotus's* Book being sent to the Church of *Lyons*, they employed one of their Deacons, named *Florus*, to write against him. This Deacon some time before delivering his Opinion concerning Predestination, said in his Discourse, That God hath freely predestinated the Elect to Grace and Glory, but he only foresees the Crimes and Sins of the Reprobate, and afterwards ordains, and predestines them to Damnation; and concerning Free-will, that 'tis so much weakened by the Sin of the first Man, that it can do no good Thing unless it be enlightened, and strengthened by the Grace of Jesus Christ. The same Doctrine he teaches us in his Tract against *Scotus*, and lays down a two-fold Predestination, or rather Predestination under a two-fold Respect. 1. A gratuitous Predestination of the Elect to Grace and Glory, and a Predestination of the Reprobate to Damnation, for their Sins which they commit by their own Free-will; and maintains, that tho' our Free-will can choose that which is good, yet it never would choose, or do it, if it were not assisted by the Grace of Jesus Christ. And to explain this, he makes use of the Comparison of a sick Man, of whom we may say, that he may recover his Health, although he hath need of Physick to restore it; or of a dead Man, that he may be raised, but by the Divine Power. In like Manner, saith he, the Free-will being dis-tempered and dead, by the Sin of the first Man, may be revived, but not by its own Vertue, but by the Grace and Power of God, who hath Pity on it, which *Florus* understands not only of that Grace, which is necessary for Actions, but of that also which is necessary to seek Conversion by Prayer, and begin to do well: Hitherto neither *Prudentius*, nor the Church of *Lyons*, nor any other Author, had declared themselves for *Gottschalcus*. They contented themselves in thus treating upon the Question, without engaging on either side. *Florus*, who in his first Discourse thought him much to blame, seems to doubt in his Answer to *Scotus*, where in the 4th. Chapter he says, That he knows not how that unhappy Monk was condemned and imprisoned; adding, That if he was really guilty of Heresie, as he is accused, it were just, that according to the Custom of the Church, all the Churches of the Kingdom should be acquainted with his Condemnation, and the Cause why he was condemned. [This Treatise is extant in *Mauguin's Vindic. Gratiae* at Paris, 1650. p. 575. and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* Tom. 8.]

Amolo's
Letters to
Gottschalcus.

Nevertheless, *Amolo* Archbishop of *Lyons* wrote a Letter to *Gottschalcus* about the same time, in which it appears, that he thought him faulty. In the Beginning of it, he gives him the Title of *Most Dear Brother*, (although he says, he knew him an Enemy to Brotherly Unity) because Christian Charity ought not to cease nor be cooled, even towards those that are our Enemies. He tells him, that he loves him most heartily, and wishes as well to him as to himself; But he says, that having read and examined his Writings, which he had sent him by a Brother, he had disputed with himself a long time whether he should answer him, because he had been accused a long time of dangerous Attempts against the Church, and had still held his Opinion, although he was condemned by the Authority of a Council for his Obstinacy; That he was afraid lest he should be thought imprudent in holding Correspondence by Letters with a Person who had been condemned by his Brethren; but on the other side, he took himself obliged by Christian Charity, to answer his Request. Lastly, That being convinced by the Admonition which Jesus Christ propounds in the Parable of the Samaritan, that it is our Duty to comfort our Brethren in Affliction, and to have such a sincere Charity towards our Brethren, as to live in Unity, and communicate one with another in all Offices and Services of Love; after he had begged God's Grace to enable him to give him necessary Comforts and Instructions, and to fit his Mind to receive them with Meekness and Humility, he looked upon himself to be under Obligations to answer him. And first of all, he advises him to be of a peaceable and submissive Spirit. He tells him, That he had heard with Grief, that he had begun to spread abroad his new Doctrines, and to raise Disputes about unprofitable Questions in *Germany*. That since he had seen one of his Writings, in which he explains his Opinion at length, and endeavours to prove it by the Testimonies of the Fathers, and Holy Scripture. And lastly, That he had lately received a Writing of his, directed to the Bishops, or rather made against the Bishops who were concerned in his Condemnation. That by his Writings he per-

ceived, that his Tenents were dangerous; so that he thought he could not do a better Piece of Service, than to set down in short those Propositions that seemed contrary to the Doctrine of the Church, and confute them by Scripture, and the Judgment of the Church. That he ought to keep firmly on to that Doctrine, if he will be one of the living Members of Jesus Christ. That he did not send this Work directly to him, because he was excommunicated, but to his Metropolitan, that he being moved with Compassion toward him, may admit him again into the Unity of the Church upon the abjuring of his Errors. After this Preface he saith, that this Proposition which he hath delivered displeaseth him. That all those that are redeemed by the Blood of Christ cannot perish; because he says, 'twill then follow, that either no Man that is baptized can be damned; or, that those who are baptized, and regenerate by Baptism, and yet afterward perish, are not truly baptized, nor redeemed by the Blood of Jesus Christ; now both are false, and contrary to the Scripture, and Faith of the Church. In the second Place, he is angry that he is persuaded that the Holy, and True Sacraments of the Church, Exorcism, Baptism, Confirmation, Unction, and the Eucharist, are given to no purpose, to those that are in the Number of the Reprobate, because they are not redeemed by the Blood of Jesus Christ, without which the Sacraments are no better than useless Ceremonies. He maintains, that they do effectually work upon those that do not persevere. In the third Place, he can't approve that which he holds, That Infants and adult Persons, who are baptized, but are not of the Number of the Elect, are not true Members of the Church of Jesus Christ. In the fourth Place, he doth not like his Words, where speaking of Predestination, he saith, That the Devils and Reprobates are predestined to Damnation, so that none of them can be saved. He affirms, That this is an horrible Blasphemy against God, and an Impiety that makes Sin necessary. That God, indeed, foresees the Sins of Devils and wicked Men, without which they would be necessitated; and that he hath not destined them to eternal Punishments but upon the Prevision of their Sins, which he knew they would commit freely. Fifthly, He abhors the Proposition delivered by *Gottschalcus*, that the Damned are as infallibly, and irrevocably predestined to Damnation, as God is Infallible and Immutable: And he laughs at that which he adds, That the Bishops ought to exhort the Reprobate to pray, that tho' their Damnation is irrevocable, yet their Torments may be less. Sixthly, He can't endure what he hath said, That God and his Saints rejoyce at the eternal Condemnation of the Reprobates. He says, That God rejoyces in their Destruction, but not for it; That he rejoyces not in their Evil doing, but in the Exaltation of his own Justice. Lastly, He condemns his Behaviour toward the Bishops, by railing at them, contemning them, and calling them, that are not of his Judgment, Hereticks and Rabanists. He chides him for being unconcerned at the Separation of the Church which he had suffered a long time, for exalting himself against his Spiritual Fathers the Bishops, for submitting to no Authority, nor desiring a peaceable Decision of the Controversy in hand with Humility, and for thinking himself the only Person enlightened and inspired by God to confirm the Truth. He exhorts, advises, and conjures him to reflect upon himself, return from his Errors to the Church, and submit himself to the Bishops; and gives him, with a fatherly Goodness, such other Councils as were proper for him to follow. [This Epistle is printed by *Mauguin* in *Collect. Script. 9. Se-culi*, Tom. 2. and with his other Works, at the End of *Agobardus's* Works put out by *Baluzius* at Paris, 1666.]

Some have pretended, that this Writing of *Gottschalcus*, which *Amolo* confutes in his Letter, was forged by *Hincmarus*, whom they accuse of this Forgery, but they have no Proof of it, and the two Conjectures upon which they ground the Accusation are too weak to raise any Credit upon, so that 'twould be a very rash thing to condemn so illustrious an Archbishop of so scandalous a Crime without better Proofs, especially since we do not find any of the Favourers of *Gottschalcus* to have laid any such thing to his Charge. It is most reasonable for us to believe, that *Gottschalcus* composed this Writing privately, and sent it to *Amolo* Archbishop of *Lyons*, supposing that that Church would be more favourable to him, because it was of St. *Austine's* Judgment about Predestination and Grace; but since he strain'd his Opinions to too high and faulty a Pitch, and drew hard and unwarrantable Consequences from them, 'tis no wonder that *Amolo* gave him such an Answer, which is written with all the insinuating Art possible to appease *Hincmarus*, and oblige this Monk to make him Satisfaction. There is another small Piece, which is annexed to this Letter to *Gottschalcus*, which is thought to be a Fragment of the Letter written at the same time to *Hincmarus*, in which he treats of Grace and Predestination. In it he teaches us to believe, that 'tis Grace by which Men are saved, which is not given them according to their Merits, but through the pure and free Mercy of God, which moves them to Good not by Necessity, but by their Will and Love. That this Grace is given to Infants in their Baptism, to adult Persons, and all

the Faithful, in all their Actions, Thoughts and Words that are good, because there is no Good but is the Gift of God: That his Prescience is certain, and that he foresees how all things will come to pass; so that the Number of the Elect is known to him, and cannot be changed. That the Predestination of the Just is of free Mercy, and is not done in Consideration of their Merits; but that he hath justified and sanctified by his Grace in time; all those who have been predestinated from all Eternity through his meer Mercy; that they may be holy and just. That Perseverance is a Gift of God; that our Free-will is so much weakened by Sin, that it can't raise it self to the Love of Truth and Justice, if it be not excited, healed and strengthened by the Grace which frees it. He adds, That this Doctrine needs not cast us into Despair, but gives us Confidence in the Mercy of God; That that which is found in St. *Austine*, and some other Fathers, that God hath predestinated the Wicked to Damnation, and eternal Death, ought not to be understood as tho' God constrained them by his Power, or Predestination, to be Sinners, and so damned, but in this Sense; That God hath ordain'd by his just Judgment eternal Punishments, for those that he foresaw would continue in the Mass of Perdition by the Sin of *Adam*, or who would make themselves subject to Damnation by their own voluntary Sins. [This Fragment of *Amolo's* Epistle is also extant in the fore-mentioned Edition of *Agobardus*.]

Hincmarus seeing *Amolo* thus in a Manner to condemn *Gotteschalchus*, thought it convenient to write to the Church of *Lyons* upon that Subject. Whereupon he wrote a Letter to him, giving him an Account after what Manner *Gotteschalchus* was judged and condemned in two Councils; and comprises his Doctrine under five chief Heads. 1. That God hath predestined from all Eternity, those whom he pleaseth to the Kingdom of Heaven, or eternal Damnation. 2. That they that are predestined to eternal Death can't be saved, and those that are predestined to eternal Glory can't be damned. 3. That God will not have all Men to be saved, and that the Apostles Words ought to be understood only of those that are saved. 4. That Jesus Christ came not to save all Men; that he hath not suffered for all Men, but for those only who are saved by the Mystery of his Passion. 5. That since the Fall of Man, no Man can keep himself safe by his own Free-will from the Commission of Sin. *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*, wrote also to the Church of *Lyons* upon the same Subject, telling them, that of those six Persons who had written upon these Questions, none of them had sufficiently cleared them. Some join to these Letters one of *Rabanus's* written to *Notingus*. [*Pardulus's* Letter to the Church of *Lyons* is not extant.]

When these Letters were carried to *Lyons*, *Remigius*, who succeeded *Amolo* in the Archbishoprick of *Lyons*, wrote, in the Name of his Church, an Answer to three Letters that were brought him. He abandons *Gotteschalchus*, and condemns the Rashness and Temerity of that unhappy Monk, but defends the Opinion of St. *Austine* about Predestination and Grace; and after he hath produced seven Rules, and several Passages of the Holy Fathers, to prove that the Prescience and Predestination of God are infallible; he concludes, that none of those whom God hath predestined from all Eternity to his Glory, through his free Goodness, shall perish; and none of those, whom God hath predestined to eternal Death, through his just Judgment, having foreseen their Sin, shall be saved, not that they are unavoidably sentenced to Damnation, by the Power of God, but because they deserve it by the Malignity of their Will, which is unconquerable, and unchangeable. This was the Sense of *Remigius*, upon two of the Propositions which *Hincmarus* reproved *Gotteschalchus* for. Concerning the third, which respected the Will of God to save all Men, he says, That 'twas a difficult Doctrine to resolve; but 'tis certain, that all are not saved, and that all that God wills shall come to pass. How then can he will all Men should be saved, when 'tis plain all Men are not? He finds this Difficulty resolved four ways in the Writings of the Fathers. 1. They say, that All is put in that Place for all Sorts of Persons. 2. For all those that are saved, because there is none saved but by him. 3. Because he inspires his Servants with Desires and Wishes, that all Men should be saved. 4. That he will have all Men to be saved, as Creator, because he hath given them a Will by which they may be saved, if they please. He saith, that this last Explication hath many Difficulties attending it, because God doth not expect the Will of Man to save them, but prevents them with his Grace. Yet he confesses, that according to some Fathers, it may be said, that God, as Creator, would have all Men to be saved; but at the same time, as he is Judge, he will not have them saved who dye in their Sins, either Original or Actual. So that 'tis not true, that God doth not accomplish his Will that he hath, that all Men should be saved, because of the Opposition of Man's Will to his, but because he will not have it fulfilled himself; that he may punish their Sins. He adds, that these things are so obscure and intricate, that he is not willing to contend much about them, nor define them rashly, but contents himself to hold what is certain, without engaging in these fruitless Disputes. Nor is he more willing to deliver his Opinion

VOL. II.

rashly about the 4th. Question concerning Christ's dying for all Men, but would search diligently in the Scripture what he ought to believe. Wherefore, after he has recited several Texts which prove that Jesus Christ died for the Redemption of Men and of the World, he saith, that in the Order of Reconciliation, the first Men are the Elect, of whom none can perish. The second are the Faithful, who have received their Baptism sincerely, and whose Sins are pardoned by Grace, but do not persevere. The third are such as yet remain in their Infidelity, but shall soon be called through the Mercy of God. The fourth are those that will remain always in their Infidelity, and shall not receive Grace, either for a time, or in the end. He acknowledges and proves, by the Authority of the Fathers, that Jesus Christ died for the three first, but maintains, that properly speaking, he died not for the Wicked, who were Dead before his coming, without the Knowledge of the true Religion, nor for Infidels, which are born since, or shall be born in future Ages. He adds, nevertheless, that he finds some Fathers, who assert that Jesus Christ died for those Infidels that were never baptized, nor converted; which Expression, he says, may be tolerated for Peace sake, though it be not exact nor true. That Men ought not to condemn one another in Questions of this Nature, because there may be some things which we know not because of our Ignorance. Concerning the last Proposition, he says, that he much wonders that any Man should hold, that since the Fall of *Adam* Men can't use their Free-will to do Good. He says, if they had added, Without Grace, the Proposition had been Orthodox, but to say it in general, as supposing that Grace alone does all the Good we do, is a Proposition which he never heard of before nor understood, and which the Hereticks themselves never yet asserted. He owns, That the Free-will may be said to be dead and perished by the Sin of the first Man; provided it be not meant, that the Nature and Essence of the Will is perished, but that the Good which is in the Will, i. e. the Faculty of inclining it self to Good, and that it hath need of the immediate Grace of Jesus Christ to incline it to Good. *Remigius* Archbishop of *Lyons*, after he hath thus treated of the Doctrine contain'd in the Letter of *Hincmarus*, passes to the Judgment and Person of *Gotteschalchus*. He finds fault, that he was first of all condemned by the Abbots and Monks, which were of the Council, to undergo their regular Discipline, and afterwards was judged by the Bishops. He says, That according to the ancient Usage, since he was accused of Heresie, he ought to have been judged by the Bishops only. He complains of the Cruelty with which their Sentence was executed. And as to the Heads of his Doctrine related by *Hincmarus*, he says, That the first and second were agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church and Fathers; that the 3d. and 4th. were not to be condemned; and as to the 5th. if it were true that he asserted it in those Terms, it deserves to be condemned. In fine, That he deserved to be condemned for his Imprudence and Troublesomeness, for his Talkativeness and Inconstancy: That nevertheless they ought not for all that to condemn the Truth, nor use him with so much Severity and Cruelty as they had done. Then he confutes what *Hincmarus* had said concerning the Will of God to save all Men, against the Predestination of the Wicked to Damnation, and concerning Free-will. He also answers the Letters of *Pardulus* and *Rabanus*. This Answer was accompanied with another small Treatise from *Remigius*, intitled, *A Resolution of the Question*, in which he endeavours to confirm the Principle of St. *Austine*; That all the Generation of Mankind is corrupted by the Sin of *Adam*, and subject to Damnation, of whom some are chosen through mere Mercy, others left through just Judgment, the one are elected through the free Mercy of God to Glory, the other predestined for their own or the first Man's Sin to Damnation. [This Treatise of *Remigius*, with some other Tracts of his are extant in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 15. and are put out by *Mauguin* in *Collect. Script. de Præd. & Grat.*

This Answer not being such an one as *Hincmarus* expected, he endeavoured to establish his Doctrine another way. Wherefore meeting at *Quiercy*, in his return from the Council of *Soissons* held in 853, with several Bishops and Abbots, he propounded four Heads of Doctrine to the Emperor, which were published by his Authority. The I. was, That there is no other Predestination but only to Life, by which God hath chosen out of the Mass of Perdition, into which all Men are fallen by the Sin of *Adam*, those whom he hath predestined by his Grace to Glory. And as to those whom he hath left in the State of Damnation, he foresaw that they would perish, but he hath not predestined them to Destruction, but only hath predestined the eternal Punishment which they have deserved. The II. is, That the Free-will which we have lost by the Sin of the first Man, is restored by Jesus Christ, and we have a full Power to do Good by the Assistance of his Grace, and to do Evil, being forsaken by it. The III. is, That God would have all Men without Exception to be saved, although they are not all saved. That those that are saved, are so by the Grace of Christ, and those that perish are damned for their own Sins. The IV. was, That Jesus Christ hath suffered for all Men, although all

P

Men

Men are not redeemed by the Mystery of his Passion, which doth not happen because the Price of Redemption is not great enough, or sufficient, but because they have not Faith, or not such a Faith as is saving, i. e. a Faith which worketh by Love.

These four Articles were signed by the Bishops and Abbots present at their Assembly, and if we may believe *Hincmarus*, were subscribed by *Prudentius* himself. But this Bishop repenting of what he had done, wrote to the Bishops assembled at *Sens* to choose a Bishop of *Paris*, that since he could not be present himself at that Synod, he had sent *Arnoldus*, a Priest, to whom he had given commission to subscribe to their Election of a Bishop, provided they would sign and approve these four Articles concerning Grace. 1. That the Free-will of Man which was lost by the disobedience of *Adam*, is so far restored by the Grace of Jesus Christ, that we cannot do, think, or desire any good thing without it. 2. That God hath predestinated some to Eternal Life through his mere Mercy, and others through his just Judgment to Damnation. 3. That the Blood of Jesus Christ was shed for them that believe on him, and not for those that do not believe. 4. That God saves all those he will have saved, and that no Man can be saved whom he will not have saved. 'Tis not known what effect this Letter had in the Council of *Sens*, but it is probable that it was read, but nothing was determined in that matter.

But the 4 Articles of *Quiercy* being sent to the Church of *Lyons*, the Archbishop examined them, and confuted them in a Book made on purpose, [intituled, *A Censure of the Articles of Quiercy, or a Book proving that the Truth of Scripture is to be held, and the Judgments of the Holy Fathers followed.*] In answer to the first Article, he finds fault with these Assertions; 1. That the first Man was free to do good, not mentioning the Divine Assistance, without which neither he nor the Angels themselves can do good; 2. That they speak of the Predestination of the Elect, as if it were made upon the account of their good Works foreseen; 3. That they deny, that God hath predestinated the Wicked to Damnation. Upon the 2d. Article he objects, 1. That they have spoken too succinctly and briefly about Free-will, having said nothing, but produced some Explications of the Fathers upon that point; 2. That they had asserted, that we have utterly lost our Free-will by the Sin of the first Man, though the Fathers acknowledge, that though it be weakened by that Sin, it still subsists in Man, but he can't use it well without the assistance of Grace. That all Men have naturally Judgment, Reason, and Understanding, by which they are able to distinguish that which is good from that which is evil, and that which is just from that which is unjust. That they also have a liberty of choosing good in some sort, but through the love they have to Humane Affairs, 'tis wholly carried upon the good of Society, Transactions of the World, and certain private Interests. Lastly, That in that respect we can do some good, but we can do nothing towards our Eternal Happiness but by the Inspiration and Motions of Grace. 3. He also reproves them in this Article for saying, that after Regeneration we have liberty of doing evil, as if we had it not before Regeneration. Concerning the 3d. Article, which is about the Will of God to save all Men, part of his Remarks are lost, but by what remains we may see, that he disapproved their asserting of it so generally, and had rejected the Fathers Explications of it. In the last Article he reproves them for saying, 1. That there is no Man's Nature that is not healed by Jesus Christ, and asserts, that Jesus Christ did not assume the Humane Nature of necessity, but of his own good will, and that for the Elect; 2. He dislikes them for holding, that there is not, never was, nor shall be a Man for whom Christ died not. He confesses that he died for all that are baptized, and for the Righteous Men of the Old Testament, but denies, that he died for all Infidels which died before Christ's Nativity, for those who never received the Faith, or Infants dying without Baptism. He maintains, that Christ died for none, but for those for whom the Church prays, and mentions in their Holy Services after their Death. Lastly, he disapproves their comparison between Infidels that never received the Faith, and Christians, who though they have been baptized, die in their Sins. [This Confutation of *Remigius* of the Articles of *Quiercy* is extant with the Treatises last mentioned.]

Remigius Bishop of *Lyons* having thus confuted the Articles made at *Quiercy* by his own Writings, caused his Doctrine to be confirmed in a Council held at *Valence*, An. 855. made up of 14 Bishops of the Provinces of *Lyons*, *Arles*, and *Vienna*, in which the 3 Metropolitans presided, and *Ebbo* Bishop of *Grenoble* was present. They made 6 Canons in this Synod concerning Grace, Free-will, and Predestination. The first forbids all Novel Expressions about such Matters, and commands Men to follow the Doctrine of the *Latin* Fathers. In the 2d. they declare, that God hath foreseen from all Eternity all the Good which Righteous Men will do by his Grace, and all the Evil that Sinners will do by their own Malice; That the Righteous shall receive Eternal Life

as a Reward of their good Actions, and the Wicked be condemned justly for their Crimes to Eternal Punishment. That this Prescience lays no necessity upon any Man, none being condemned but for their Original or actual Sins. In the 3d. the Bishops strongly assert the Predestination of good Men to Eternal Life, and of wicked Men to Eternal Death. Nevertheless after such a manner, as that in the Choice of them that shall be saved, the Mercy of God goes before their Works, but on the contrary in the Damnation of those that perish their Crimes go before the just Judgment of God, yet God hath predestinated no Man to sin by his own power, so that those that are predestinated are under necessity of being damned. The 4th. is about the Death of Jesus Christ, concerning which they think it sufficient to say, and confess sincerely, that Jesus Christ died for all those that believe in him. They reject the 4 Canons of *Quiercy* as idle, vain, and false, and condemn *Scotus's* Treatise as a silly Book. In the 5th. they assure all those that are Baptized and Regenerate, that they have a part in the Redemption of Jesus Christ, although afterward they lose the Innocency of Baptism, and are in the number of the Reprobate. Lastly, in the last they declare, that as concerning the Grace of Christ, by which Men are saved, and the Free-will of Man weakened by the Sin of *Adam*, but restored by the Grace of Jesus Christ, they do hold as the Holy Fathers have taught, what the Councils of *Africa* and *Orange* have decided, and what is held and maintained by the Bishops of the Apostolick See.

These Canons of the Council of *Valence* were presented to the Emperor *Lotharius*, the King of these Bishops who had made them, with the Treatise made upon that Subject by the Church of *Lyons*, and the Propositions of *Scotus*, that he might send them to *Charles the Bald*, and that he would advise him at the same time not to suffer the contrary Doctrine to be published in his Realm, but *Lotharius* not being to do it, *Ebbo* Bishop of *Grenoble* presented these Pieces himself to *Charles the Bald*, who went to him to his Palace at *Perbery*, An. 856. This Prince in September the same year, delivered them to *Hincmarus* to examine them, who composed an Answer to them. His Book was of a considerable bulk, and dedicated to *Charles the Bald*; it was intituled, *Of Predestination and Free-will*, and divided into 3 parts. We have not the Work itself, but only the Letter written to *Charles*, which served for a Preface to it. In it he complains that they had condemned his 4 Articles without so much as reciting of them, and had put a bad construction upon them. That they would have him undertake the Defence of *Scotus's* Propositions, which he never saw, nor knew, and which were collected only to make Orthodox Persons odious. That they had made this noise without desiring his Opinion, without advertizing him of what they disliked, without hearing him or citing him to the Synod. He wondered that *Ebbo* Bishop of *Grenoble*, a Person so eminent for Piety, should engage in such a Faction. He observes by the bye, as a thing extraordinary, that of all the Bishops that were at the Council of *Valence*, he only was named in the Head of the Council amongst the Archbishops, which looked like affectation of Greatness, though he would not call it Pride. Lastly, That the Bishops of this Council had began the Quarrel, and laid the foundation of the Difference. He then lays down the order of his Answer; first, he tells the Emperor, that he had sent him the Writings which had been presented to him by the Council; 2. That he had joined to them several other Tracts which he had received from other places upon the same Subject, of which he approved so much only as was agreeable to his 4 Articles; That he will make a Collection of the Authorities and Passages of the Fathers. Lastly, That he will prove, that these Articles are agreeable to the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome*, and the Scriptures, which she acknowledges for genuine, and the Fathers whose Writings she allows, to which he will add the Authorities of more late Orthodox Writers, as *Beda*, *Alcuinus*, and *Theodorus*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*.

In the year 859. the same Bishops which were present at the Council of *Valence* being met in the Suburbs of *Langres* with the Emperor *Charles*, presented to him the 6 Canons under debate, but suppressed what was said in them particularly against the 4 Articles of *Hincmarus*; Fifteen Days after they met at a Council at *Savona* in the Province of *Toul* [or *Tullium*], where they were also read. *Hincmarus* and those of his Party opposed their Reception, but *Remigius* Archbishop of *Lyons* desired, that the Decision of the Controversie might be entirely left to the next Synod, to which they would every one bring the Books of the most eminent Fathers of the Church, and out of them determine what they should follow, that they might be of one mind. This was the conclusion of this Council, but *Prudentius* did not rest here but brought the matter to *Rome*, sending the Canons of the Council of *Valence* to Pope *Nicholas*, that he might confirm them. *Prudentius*, says the Pope, approved of them, but *Hincmarus* did not yield to it, and would not take notice of the Definition which he had pulled upon the Question.

We do not find that this Question was afterward examined or judged in any Council of France, but *Hincmarus* made another Treatise of Predestination to defend his 4 Articles, and confute the Canons of the Council of Valence. This also is dedicated to *Charles the Bald*, containing 38 Chapters. In the first he treats of the Original of the Heresie of the Predestinarians, and pretends to prove, that it began since the time of St. *Austine*; and to prove it, he makes use of the Testimonies not only of St. *Austine*, but of St. *Prosper* and *Calestine*, by whom it appears that St. *Austine's* Doctrine of Grace was opposed by several, but he doth not observe, that they who opposed it then, were altogether opposite to the Error of the Predestinarians, for the Priests of *Marseilles*, and the other Frenchmen of whom St. *Austine* and *Prosper* speak, were so far from being Predestinarians, that they contradicted the Doctrine of St. *Austine* about Predestination, because it seemed too rigorous. He cites a Book falsely attributed to St. *Austine*, called *Hypomnesticon*; He maintains very positively that it is his, and proves it by the Letter of *Fausus* to *Lucidus* about the recantation of that Priest, and by the Authority of the Council of *Arles*, which through a mistake (he says) was held by the Authority of *Calestine*, who was dead 44 years before that Council. In the 2d. he gives the History of *Gottschalkus*, whom he pretends to have revived the Error of the Predestinarians. In the 3d. he rejects the Authority of *Fulgentius*, but he gives one bad Reason for it, when he says, that he is not much to be esteemed, because Pope *Gelasius* doth not reckon him among the Doctors of the Church, for *Gelasius* was dead 8 or 9 years before this Father wrote. In the 4th. he proves himself conformable to the Doctrine of the Apostolick See. In the 5th. after he hath observed that *Gottschalkus* and his Followers write the Authorities of the Scripture and Fathers to establish that Error imperfectly, he brings the Propositions of *Gottschalkus*, *Prudentius*, and *Ratramnus*, in which they acknowledge Predestination to Eternal Torments. In the 6th. he begins to treat of the Canons of the Council of Valence in particular. He observes in that Chapter, that the first is taken out of *Florus*, a Deacon of the Church of *Lyon*, but his Sentence is changed and altered by him that transcribed and abridged it. In the 7th. he explains the Passage of St. *Paul* alledged by the Compiler of them, in which he says there are Vessels of Wrath fitted for Destruction. He cites several places of the Fathers to explain that Text, and shew, that 'tis not God that hath fitted those Vessels for Death, but they fitted themselves for it by their Sins. In the 8th. he alledges some places in *Fulgentius*, to shew, that God hath predestinated no Man to Death. In the 9th. he cites some Passages of *Isidore of Sevil*, St. *Austine*, St. *Fulgentius*, and *Florus*, to explain those which his Adversaries had alledged. In the 10th. he expounds several places of Scripture which they made use of. In the 11th. he examines the following Canon of the Council of Valence. He finds fault, that they had laid aside the Explication of *Florus*, and distinguished between Predestination to Grace and Predestination to Glory. In the 12th. he treats of Predestination at large according to the Principles of St. *Austine*. He saith that God hath predestinated the Works as well as the Glory of the Elect. That he hath foreseen the Sins of the Reprobate, and knowing them, not only foresees, but predestines the Punishment which they shall suffer, but he affirms, that it can't be said, that he hath predestinated them to Death or Damnation. So that all the difference between *Hincmarus* and his Adversaries is in this, that these affirm, that God foreseeing the Sins which the Reprobate would voluntarily commit, hath predestinated and condemned them upon the account of them to Damnation. And *Hincmarus* confesses, that God hath prepared and predestinated this Eternal Punishment for their Crimes, but will not say that he hath predestinated them to be damned. St. *Fulgentius* in his Book which he wrote to *Monimus*, was most favourable to the Opinion which *Hincmarus* opposes, for which reason it is, that in the 13th. Chapter he opposes some Passages of St. *Prosper*, and in his 14th. a Passage of St. *Austine's* cited by *Fulgentius* himself. In the 15th. Chapter he returns to the History of the pretended Predestinarians. He says that the ancient Predestinarians had 4 Errors. The first, That God condemns Men for the Sins which they have not committed, but would have committed had they lived. The 2d. that Baptism doth not take away Original Sin from them who are not of the number of the Predestinated. The 3d. that there is no difference between Predestination and Predestination. The 4th. that God hath predestinated Men to Sin and Damnation. He owns, that the Modern Predestinarians held not the first Error, that they pass by the 2d, avoid the 3d, and have new moulded the 4th, although they retain the substance of it, asserting, that God hath predestinated the Reprobate to Damnation, although he hath not predestinated them to Sin, since they can't suffer Damnation but by Sin. He confutes the two former Errors in a few words. Then he undertakes to justify his 4 Articles, by showing that they are agreeable to the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, and chiefly of St. *Austine*, St. *Fulgentius*, and St. *Gregory*. He proves the first, which is concerning Pre-

destination, by transcribing in the 16th. Chapter several long Quotations of those Fathers. In the 17th. he examines a place in the Book intituled, *Hypomnesticon*, attributed to St. *Austine*. In the 18th. he proves, that the number of the Elect is certain, and determined. In the 19th. he owns, that a double Predestination may in some Sense be allowed, though not in that of *Gottschalkus* and his Adherents, who affirm, that God hath predestinated Sinners to Torments, as he hath the Good to Glory, but that it may be said, the Elect are predestinated to Glory, and Eternal Torments are predestinated for the Wicked. In the 20th. he examines in what Sense St. *Gregory* speaks of the Predestinarians in the Plural Number. In the 21st. Chapter he produces several Passages of St. *Austine*, to justify the Sense and Terms of his 2d. Article of Free-will. In the 22d. he shews, that what is said in that Article is conformable to the Decisions of the Councils of *Africa* and *Orange* about Grace and Free-will. In the 23d. he answers the Accusation brought against him, that he had affirmed, that Man had wholly lost his Free-will by the Fall of *Adam*; He owns, that Man hath a freedom of Will since *Adam's* Sin, but his Free-will is a Slave to Sin, which leads him to the commission of Evil only, so that he can't do any good through the weakness of it without the Grace of Jesus Christ. In the 24th. Chapter he treats about his 3d. Article, which is about the Will of God to save all Men. He declares, that the Church of *Rome*, which is the first Church in the World, ought to be consulted about that point in the first place. He compares it to the Ancient *Jerusalem*, and cites a Passage in the forged Decretal of Pope *Anacletus*, which says, that that Church was founded by God himself. He adds also a Citation out of *Innocent's* Letter to *Decentius* Bishop of *Eugubium*, after which he quotes a Sentence of *Calestine*, where he says, that the Prayers of the Church determine what we shall believe, *Legem credendi Lex statuat supplicandi*; From whence he concludes, that since the Church prays for all Men without restriction, or exception, we ought to believe, that God will have all Men to be saved without exception. But why then are not all Men saved? He says, 'tis because they will not; They that love Darkness rather than Light, Injustice than Justice, Sin than Virtue, destroy themselves; That it will not then follow, that God is not Almighty, because he knows how to dispose of their Actions who will not do as he wills them. Whereupon he cites several Passages out of St. *Austine* and St. *Gregory*, but depends chiefly upon the words of St. *Chrysostome*. In the next Chapter he joins some expressions taken out of the Writings attributed to St. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, St. *Cyprian*, St. *Hilary*, St. *Chrysostome*, St. *Theophilus*, St. *Jerome*, and St. *Cyril*, some things also he brings out of St. *Austine* and St. *Prosper*, to whom also he adds St. *Calestine*, St. *Leo*, St. *Gregory*, *Bede*, and *Cassiodore*. In the following Chapter he confirms this Doctrine of the Will of God to save all Men without exception, because if God would not have all Men to be saved, some would be under a necessity of Damnation. And whereas his Adversaries objected, that the Will of God is all powerful, and therefore, if God would have all Men to be saved, they would be so; he puts the same Question to them as to the Angels, and urges them to answer it. Are those Angels which are fallen, fallen by the Will of God, or not? And since they could not deny according to their own Principle, but that God did desire their Salvation: He concludes, that they must own, that God's Will hath not always its effect. He there recites several Passages of the Fathers to explain those places of Scripture where the All-powerful Will of God is spoken of. In the 27th. Chapter he examines the State of the Question concerning the 4th. Article, the Death of Jesus Christ for all Men. He declares, that it extends not to the Devils, for whom Jesus Christ was no Mediator, but only to Men. And whereas it was demanded of him, whether Jesus Christ died for Antichrist; He answers, that Antichrist shall be a Man, and since Jesus Christ died for all Men, he is of the number of those for whom Christ died. In the 28th. Chapter he cites several Passages of the Fathers, to prove, that Jesus Christ died for those Men who are dead in their Sins, although it can't be said, that they are redeemed for Eternal Salvation. In the 29th. he justifies the Expression which he had delivered, that there never was a Man whose flesh was not assumed by Jesus Christ, and cites several places of the Fathers which approve that Expression. He then shews, that those that are Baptized receive the Faith that worketh by Love, which he had affirmed in his last Article. He adds in the following Chapter, that except two Sentences of it, the rest of that Article is taken out of St. *Prosper*.

Hincmarus having thus justified himself, passes his judgment upon the Writings which were come to his hands, made upon this subject. He disapproves *Scotus's* and *Prudentius's* Books, and says, that he will not enter into any Contest with them because he does not know their design, yet he tells us, that he had observed some Expressions in them contrary to the Catholick Truth, viz. That there is a Triple Divinity; That the Sacrament of the Altar is not the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but a Memorial

only of his true Body and Blood; that the Angels are Corporeal; that the Soul of Man is not in his Body; that the Tortures of Hell are nothing else but the Remembrance of Sins, and the Reflection of a guilty Conscience; and other fruitless Questions concerning the Manner how we shall see God, which arise perhaps, saith *Hincmarus*, from hence, that those who are busied to move such Disputes take no Care to see him. He rejects the 7. Rules laid down by *Prudentius*. In the 31st. Chapter he shews, That those that lived before the coming of Jesus Christ are redeemed by his Death, as well as those that live after his coming. In the 32^d. he produces a great Number of Testimonies both from the Greek and Latin Fathers, to prove, that Jesus Christ died for all Men without Exception. In the next Chapter he confirms the same Doctrine by several Reasons grounded upon the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, and shews, that although Jesus Christ died for all Men, yet they are not all redeemed and saved, because they will not. In the 35th. he approves the 5th. Canon of the Council of *Valence*, propounded by his Adversaries; That Jesus Christ died for all those that are regenerate by Baptism; But he maintains, that *Gotteschalvus* and the Predestinarians deny that Baptism washes away the Guilt of Original Sin from those that are not predestinated, and confutes their Error.

Hincmarus's Remarks upon the Constitution of the Council of Valence about Ordinations.

The Bishops of the Council of *Valence*, after the Articles of Grace, Free-will, and Predestination, confuted by *Hincmarus*, added a Canon concerning the Ordinations of Bishops to this Effect: To prevent for the Future, that ignorant Bishops, unable to discharge that great Function, and whose Lives are not sufficiently examined, may not be put into the Sees, as they formerly have been, (to the utter Ruine and Overthrow of all Church Discipline) it is decreed, That after the Death of any Bishop, they should petition the Princes to grant the People and Clergy of that City Power to make a Canonical Election of some Person of the same, or the neighbouring Diocese, who is fit to fill the See, and if any Clerk be sent from Court to be made their Bishop, they should strictly examine and look into his Life, and Doctrine, and Manners, before they ordain him; and if he be found an Ignorant, Vicious, and Simoniackal Person, the Metropolitan should refuse to ordain him, and going to Court represent it to the Prince. *Hincmarus* imagining, that this Canon was made against him, and some other Bishops who had been ordained through the Favour of the Court, takes it into Examination, and therefore, in the 36th. Chapter he observes first, that this Canon makes directly against him whom he thought the Author of it, because he was shaved and ordained in another Church than that of which he was Bishop, evidently meaning *Remigius* Archbishop of *Lyons*. Secondly, he observes, That he had left out several things which concerned the Ordination of a Bishop, as for Example, If they choose a Clergyman of another Church, that he should not be ordained till his Bishop hath given his Consent. Thirdly, he says, That those Men are not worthy to bear the Names of Bishops whose Ordination was such, as he describes, Ignorant, Vicious, and Simoniackal. Fourthly, he says, That in speaking so he affronts all the Bishops of *France*, the Metropolitans who have made such unlawful Ordinations, and the Princes who have approved them. Fifthly, he defends his own Ordination, and relates the whole History of the Deposition of *Ebbo*, and the Process had against him; he relates the Judgment given in Favour of him against *Ebbo* in the Council of *Soissons* in 853, the Declaration of *Ebbo*, who acknowledged himself justly deposed, and consented another should be made Bishop in his Place, approved by the Bishops met at *Thionville* in 835, whose Sentence was confirmed by Pope *Sergius*. He adds, That 10. Years after this Deposition, the Bishops of the Diocese of *Rheims* being assembled at *Beauvais*, desired him of the Prince, and he was ordained by his Consent after he had been Canonically chosen by the Clergy and People of *Rheims*. Hereupon he

Theodosius's

says, that he spake these things with regret, but he was obliged to it, lest any Man reading this Canon should think of Grace his Ordination contrary to the Canons and Rules of the Church. Then he opposes to this Article 12. Canons of the Church concerning the Penalties to be inflicted upon such Persons as revive old Heresies that have been condemned; which are, 1. When an Error hath been once condemned by the Church, it needs no further Confutation. 2. That when the Author of an Heresie is condemned, all that fall into the same Heresie are involved in the same Condemnation. 3. That the same Condemnation extends to all the Abettors of an Heresie. 4. That they that communicate with Hereticks, ought not to be admitted to any Synod of the Orthodox. 5. That those that revive a condemned Heresie ought to be reproved by all the Bishops by Vertue of the ancient Condemnation. 6. That it is not lawful to introduce new Doctrines, nor compose new Creeds. 7. That such as acknowledge their Errors may be again received into the Church, provided that we find sure Tokens of their sincere Repentance in their Return. 8. That such Persons may never be promoted to any higher Degree of the Clergy than what they are now in. 9. That if they relapse again they deprive themselves of their Dignity. 10. That those that act any thing contrary to the Definitions of Pope *Celestine* ought to be excommunicated. 11. That such Clergymen may be received, and continued in their Degree of Priesthood, who having once assented to the true Faith, subscribe to Errors, provided they deliver a Recantation of their Errors in Writing. 12. That they that will not subscribe to the Truth are condemned of themselves. *Hincmarus* alledges a great Number of Authorities of Popes, Councils and Fathers, to prove these Points of Discipline, which never were contested, in which he shews more Learning and Skill in the Canons of the Church, than Judgment or Equity. Lastly, *Hincmarus* ending this Work, adds a Conclusion divided into 6. Chapters, in which he sums up what he had before said concerning Predestination, Grace, Free-will, the Will of God to save all Men, and the Death of Jesus Christ for Infidels.

Some time after, *Hincmarus* wrote another Treatise against *Gotteschalvus* upon another Subject. He had forbidden, that the Hymn of the Martyrs, called *Sanctorum Memoritis*, should be sung in his Church, because at the End of it the Three Persons of the Trinity were called *Trina Deitas*, thinking that Expression to be contrary to the Manner of speaking exactly about that Mystery. *Gotteschalvus* seeking an Occasion to expose and accuse him, composed a Treatise to defend this Expression, maintaining that the Trinity was *Personaliter Trina*, i. e. Personally Three, because each Person of the Trinity hath his perfect and entire Deity, & *Naturaliter una*. He justified this Expression by some Examples of like Expressions drawn out of the Fathers. *Hincmarus* maintained the contrary, that the Deity was the Name of the Nature not of the Persons, and that we might not say *Trina Deitas*, as we ordinarily do *Tres Personae*, because there is but one God in Three Persons. It is apparent, that this Dispute was only about Words and Names, which *Hincmarus* spins out to a great Length with much Zeal in his large Treatise intitled, *De Trina Deitate*, reciting several Quotations of the Fathers, and producing several Arguments, which it is both tedious and needless to abridge. We understand by *Hincmarus*, that not only *Gotteschalvus*, but also *Ratramnus* Abbot of *Corby* had written in the Defence of this Expression, and that the *Benedictine* Monks did sing this Hymn, not leaving out *Trina Deitas*. But now we do not find those Words in the Hymn of the Martyrs, which seem to be changed into *Te Summa Deitas*, for they are in the Prose of St. *Thomas* upon the *Eucharist*. [The Editions of *Hincmarus's* Works are set down at the End of the 6th. Chapter following, to which the Reader is referred.]

Hincmarus's Book upon the Expression Trina Deitas.

C H A P. III.

A Relation of the Contest between *Hincmarus* and *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*.

HINC MARUS was engaged in many other Controversies and Quarrels, which were not ended with less trouble than that with *Gotteschalvus*. The first was the Contest with *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, in which he was forced to contend with the Pope himself, and at last give place to his Judgment. This *Rothadus* had been ordained Bishop of *Soissons* in the Reign of *Lewis the Kind*. He had an Order to apprehend *Ebbo*, his Metropolitan, who was fled, and to shut him up in a Monastery, that he might attend the Synod. He was present in 835. at the Synod held at *Thionville*, where *Ebbo* was deposed. So that *Rothadus* was an ancient Bishop when *Hincmarus* was made Archbishop of *Rheims*, which was 10. years

after the Deposition of *Ebbo*, which perhaps was the Reason, that he would not give so much Respect and Subjection to *Hincmarus* as he expected of him. The Beginning of the Business of *Gotteschalvus* shews, that *Rothadus* and *Hincmarus* were not well affected to one another, for *Hincmarus* would not put that Monk into his Custody, suspecting him to be inclinable to Novelties. There were also some other differences, about which *Hincmarus* was angry with *Rothadus*; as his frequent Admonitions and Threatnings of him shewed. At last the Quarrel broke out, when *Hincmarus* accused him at the Council held at *Senlis* in 863. that he had unjustly deposed a Priest of his Diocese, and would not obey his Metropolitan, who commanded him to be restored,

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Rothadus.

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Rothadus.

Hincmarus's Accusation of Rothadus.

Of the Con-
test be-
tween
Hincma-
rus and
Rothadus.
Rotha-
dus's Ap-
peal to
Rome.
Rotha-
dus's Con-
demnation
 stored, and the Person put in his Place to be removed; that he had squandered away the Church Revenue, and pawn'd a Golden Chalice; that he had sold the Vessels and Ornaments of the Church without the Consent of his Metropolitan; the Bishops of *Provence*, yea, of the Steward and Clergy of his own Church, and that he had lived in such a way as did not become a Bishop. *Rothadus* feeling himself likely to be condemned, appealed to the Holy See, and desired that he might have Leave to go to *Rome*. *Hincmarus* and the Bishops of the Council consented to it, upon Condition that he should return by such a time. *Rothadus* returned immediately to his Diocese, and prepared for his Voyage to *Rome*. But before his Departure he wrote to the King; and *Hincmarus*, and at the same time sent some Heads of Request to a Bishop that was his Friend, to be shewn to the King, in which he prayed the Bishops that had not consented to his Condemnation, to stir in his Defence. The Priest that carried this Letter was constrained by the King and *Hincmarus* to shew it them, although the Bishop to whom it was directed was not present. When *Hincmarus* had read it, he made use of it directly to hinder his going to *Rome*, and have him judged in *France*. He interpreted this as a tacit Renunciation of his Appeal, and that he would be contented to be judged in *France* by the Bishops he had desired the Assistance of, and since they were the Judges he had chosen himself, he could not afterward appeal from them according to the Rule *Ab electis Judicibus appellare non licet*.

The Quar-
rel between
the Pope
and Hinc-
marus a-
bout the
Business of
Rothadus.
 Being therefore glad of this Opportunity, he persuaded the King to appoint those very Bishops for his Judges, whose Assistance he begged, and immediately sent a Prohibition to *Rothadus* to stop his Journey to *Rome*, and caused him to be summoned to a Synod by those Bishops. *Rothadus* refused at first to come, and insisted upon his Appeal to *Rome*, but it was denied him; so, against his Will, he was brought to the Synod, deposed, and afterward deprived, banished and imprisoned. Another Bishop was put into his Place, but to lighten his Sufferings, *Hincmarus* gave him a good Abby, with which he might live commodiously. *Hincmarus* says, that *Rothadus*, at first, seemed to acquiesce in this Judgment, but afterwards being solicited by the Bishops of the Kingdom, and by *Lotharius*, who quarrelled with him, because he would not wholly join with them in the Matter of *Waldrada*, as also by some Bishops of *Germany*, *Lewis's* Kingdom, he put himself in the Head of them, and went to *Rome*, to obtain his Restoration. But *Rothadus* on the contrary maintain'd, that he never acquiesced in that Judgment; that he always protested against it; and demanded, that he might be judged at *Rome*, and never had any Intention to choose the *French* Bishops for his Judges; that it was a Trick of *Hincmarus's*, who made that ill use of the Letter he wrote to a Bishop his Friend. But however that was, *Charles the Bald* having given Pope *Nicholas* an Account, that *Rothadus* who had governed the Diocese of *Soissons* very ill for 30. years, was deposed, and desiring him to approve his Deposition, was answered, that he did not approve it in the least; and wrote in Particular to *Hincmarus*, that he should restore *Rothadus* within 30. days, after he had received his Letter, or suffer him to come to *Rome*, and come himself, or send his Deputy on his Behalf, threatening him, that if he did not do one of them within that time, he will interdict him from the Celebrating the Holy Sacrament, and would inflict the same Sentence upon all those who consented to the Condemnation of *Rothadus*. *Hincmarus*, and the other Bishops of *France*, understanding that Pope complained of their Judgment, sent the Acts of his Deposition to him, by *Odo* a Bishop, and wrote to him at large concerning that Matter, but the Acts did only confirm the Pope in his Resolution and Opinion: Wherefore he wrote again to *Hincmarus*, that he was much troubled to see, that they had judged that Bishop contrary to the Appeal he had made to the Holy See; that they ought not to have deposed him without writing to the Bishop of *Rome*; and which is much worse, ordained another Bishop in his Place after he had entred his Appeal. For which Reason, he refused to confirm those Privileges which *Hincmarus* had requested him to do, exhorting him to amend what he had done amiss, and enjoining him a second time to send *Rothadus* to *Rome*, threatening him, that if he did not do it, he would pass a definitive Sentence upon him, after a third Admonition. He gave *Charles the Bald* also an Account of what he had written to *Hincmarus*, desiring him to take it into serious Consideration; and to shew his Displeasure, told him plainly, that he must expect no Favour from *Rome*, if he would not maintain the Privileges and Prerogatives of the Holy See. He also wrote a Letter to all the Bishops who were present at the Synod of *Senlis*, and had consented to the Deposition of *Rothadus*; in which, after some Allegations out of the Fathers, and the Canons of the Council of *Sardica*, to confirm the Right of Appeals to the Holy See, and condemning the Behaviour of the Bishops of *France*, in pronouncing Judgment against *Rothadus*, he orders them to recal him from the Place of his Exile, and to send him to *Rome*, and with him two or three Bishops, or their Deputies, that he might re-examine that Affair, assuring them, that if they did not obey his

Of the Con-
test be-
tween
Hincma-
rus and
Rothadus.
Hincma-
rus's Let-
ter to the
Pope about
Rothadus.
 Order within thirty days after they had received his Letter, he would absolve *Rothadus*, and treat them as they had used him. *Nicholas*, at the same time, also gave *Rothadus* Notice of what he had done for him, viz. That he had written to *Hincmarus*, and exhorted him to come to *Rome* and answer his Appeal; and after he had received the Acts of his Condemnation, he let him know what he had answered to the Bishops of *France*, at the same time advising him, if he knew himself guilty, to submit to the Sentence passed against him, as he had advised his Adversaries to restore him, if they believed him wrongfully condemned. He tells him also, that he was permitted to come to him, being assured by the King and *Hincmarus*, that he was already let out of the Monastery to which he was confined. He desired the King likewise to furnish him with all Things necessary for his Voyage, and tells the Queen *Hermetruda*, that he could not pass by this Matter, as she had desired him, to gratify her Husband *Charles the Bald*. It is evident that *Hincmarus*, who had a mind to keep the Matter as it was, hindered *Rothadus* from going his Journey, for *Nicholas* was forced to send him a fourth Letter, wherein he complains of his Carriage, and forbids him consecrating him Bishop of *Soissons*, who was chosen to be put in *Rothadus's* Place. *Hincmarus* seeing himself out of Favour at *Rome* about this Affair, and some other Matters, writes a long Letter to Pope *Nicholas* to justify himself, chiefly about this Matter. In the Letter he assures him, that *Rothadus* was not condemned with a Design to hinder his Appeal to the Holy See, that he was try'd by such Judges as he had made choice of himself, upon which Account it was that he thought it not necessary to send him to *Rome*, but judged it sufficient to acquaint his Holiness of the Sentence they had passed on him; that he was persuaded the Holy See ought not to be troubled with personal Differences, between either the Superior or Inferior Clergy, for the Canons of *Nice*, and the Constitutions of Pope *Innocent*, and many others, leave them to the Judgment of the Metropolitan, and Bishops of the Province. 'Tis true, when the Causes of the Bishops are difficult, and can't be decided by the ordinary Canons in a Council of the Province, then they ought to be carried to the Holy See. As also if a Bishop, who hath been tried by a Council of the Province, and hath not appealed to Judges of his own choosing, thinks himself unjustly condemned, he may appeal to the Patriarch to have his Cause re-examined, and the Pope may write to those that have been his Judges, as it is appointed in the Council of *Sardica*. That the Archbishops only receive their Pall of the Pope, who therefore ought only to be judged immediately by him. Coming in the next Place to the Business of *Rothadus*, he says, That he had been admonished of his Duty long before, and reproved for his Disorders, but not reforming in the least, he was obliged to accuse him before the Synod of Bishops, that he might grow better upon their Advice; and that instead of hearkening to them, he desired that they would be Judges of the Difference between him and his Metropolitan. That these Judges had condemned him, and he acquiesced at first in their Sentence, but afterward being solicited by the Bishops of the Provinces of *Lotharius*, and *Lewis* of *Germany*, required his Restoration. That upon the Letters that the Pope had written he was set at Liberty, and they would send him to *Rome*, but they did not think it fit to restore him, because he was unworthy, and his Disorders being so publick, they could not do it without Scandal. That if his Holiness would restore him, he would quietly submit to his Decision, but he took himself obliged to let him know the Crimes of that Bishop, of which, if he was well informed, he could not believe that he would disannul the Judgment given against him, especially since he chose the Judges himself; and according to the Council of *Carthage*, it is not allowed to appeal from the Sentence of those Judges a Person hath chosen himself. He insinuates, that according to the Council of *Sardica*, the Pope ought not to have the first Hearing of the Causes of the Bishops, nor judge them at *Rome*, but they ought first to be determined in their own Province; and in Case of Appeal, the Pope must send his Commissioners to the Places. He adds, That if he that hath been condemned at the first Tryal be restored, the latter Examination ought not to hurt the Persons of the first Judges, nor ought they to be reproved for it, unless it appears that they have condemned him out of Enmity, Covetousness, or Partiality. In fine, That if the Pope annuls the Judgment passed upon *Rothadus*, he would render all the Judgments of the Bishops of *France* ever after contemptible. As for himself, he would never concern himself to judge, or condemn any Man, but, if they would not amend upon Admonition, send them to *Rome*. And this he shall be obliged to do, to avoid the Menaces of Excommunication which the Pope hath so often repeated to him, altho' it is the Opinion of the Fathers that Excommunication ought rarely to be used, and that in Case of great Necessity. Lastly, he implores him, that his Compassion for *Rothadus* should not make him overlook the Rules of Discipline, and give an ill Example of Impunity to the Church. These Maxims he confirmed by the Canons of the Councils, and the ancient and genuine Writings of

the Popes. *Hincmarus* also in this Letter assures the Pope, that they had sent their Deputies to *Rome* in their stead, not to accuse *Rothadus*, but only to satisfy him, that the Bishops of *France* intended no Manner of Disrespect to the Holy See in judging him, and to certify the Pope, that that Bishop was condemned by those Bishops whom he chose for his Judges. But tho' *Hincmarus* had promised, in the Name of the *French* Bishops, to send their Deputies to *Rome*, nevertheless they did not go, and pretended, for an Excuse, that it was told them that the Ways were not open, and they should be stopped in their Journey if they went. Wherefore *Rothadus* went alone, and having waited almost eight Months for his Accusers, he presented a Petition to the Pope, in which he complains, That he had been deposed in contempt of his Appeal to the Holy See. He maintains, that he never desisted from his Appeal, nor did choose nor demand any other Judges. He accuseth *Hincmarus* of Compulsion and Deceit. He complains of his ill Usage which he had received from him, and prayed the Pope to try him.

Pope Nicholas's Letters in favour of Rothadus.

Nicholas, who had entertain'd him civilly, and dealt with him as a Bishop, declared himself wholly for him, and made an Oration in *St. Mary's Church* upon the Eve of the Nativity, 865. in which he pleaded *Rothadus's* Cause, and maintains, That having appealed to the Holy See, he could not choose any other Judges, nor be judged at another Tribunal; that he had not done it. And lastly, Since if he had not appealed, they could not have deposed him without acquainting the Bishop of *Rome* with it, because the Canons reserve the Knowledge of such Causes as concern the Bishops to the Holy See: He declares him innocent, and disannuls the Judgment given against him, and restores him to his Dignity; and after he had done it, with great Noise, upon a solemn Day, he makes it known to the Clergy and People of *Rome* in a Letter on purpose. He sent also an Express to *Carolus Calvus*, in which he much blames the Proceedings of *Hincmarus* in derogation of the Right which he pretended to belong to the Bishop of *Rome*, without whose Cognizance they could not judge a Bishop. He complains of the Delays which they had made for above two Years, keeping *Rothadus* from *Rome*, and neither sending their Deputies, Witnesses, nor Accusers. He declares *Rothadus* innocent, and desires the King, *Charles the Bald*, to see him restored to his Dignity and Estate. At the same time he wrote a Letter to *Hincmarus*, in which, after he had upbraided him with the same Dealings, he commands him to submit to the Judgment he had given in favour of *Rothadus*, and to execute it, or come himself to accuse him, upon Condition, nevertheless, that *Rothadus* should be first restored to his Dignity and Revenues. In Conclusion he says, That if he did not do one of them, he pronounced him, by Vertue of his Apostolick Authority, deposed from his Priestly

Dignity, and separated from the Communion of the Church, without Hopes of Restoration. He wrote also a large Letter to all the Bishops, to oblige them to receive *Rothadus*, and approve the Judgment he had given in his Favour; and taking this Occasion to greaten his Authority, he claims, as his due, that all Causes of the Bishops should be brought to the Holy See. He upholds this Pretence by the false Decretals, which he vouches to be genuine, ancient, and very authentick; and because the Causes of the Bishops are the greatest Causes, whose Cognizance belongs to the Bishop of *Rome*, according to the Constitutions of the Popes. He proves that *Rothadus* made no Choice of his Judges, because he named none in particular, but had only written to some Bishops that they would undertake his Defence; that he never renounced his Appeal, nor indeed could he, because having once appealed to a superior Tribunal, he can't be judged at an inferior. Nevertheless, he declares that he will do no Injustice to any Man, and gave them free Liberty to accuse him before the Holy See, upon Condition they should first restore him, and put him in the same Quality he was in before their Sentence passed upon him. He wrote also to the Clergy and People of *Soissons*, to congratulate the Restoration of their Bishop, and exhorts them to receive him joyfully. Lastly, he gave *Rothadus* a Letter directed to him, in which he restores him to his Dignity and Revenues, forbids all Men to trouble him, exhorts him to take care of his Bishoprick, and execute his Episcopal Functions diligently, (upon Condition nevertheless, that if after he is restored, any one shall accuse him before the Holy See, he shall be ready to defend himself) and pronounced a Sentence of Excommunication against them, who, after three Admonitions, would not restore any Goods, that belong to the Church of *Soissons*, which they had invaded, and against them who communicated with such. This Letter is dated January, Indict. 13. An. 866. [These Epistles of Pope Nicholas, with many others, are printed in one Collection at *Rome*, 1542. and in Tom. 8. of the Councils, p. 268, 480, 514, and 563.]

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Rothadus.

Rothadus furnished with all these Letters returned into *France*. The Bishops of that Kingdom seeing the Pope so earnest in that Affair, would not contend with him, but for Peace sake restored *Rothadus*, altho' they were persuaded that the Pope did not act according to the Canons, which appoint that Bishops should be judged in the Province, and that their Causes should not be carried to *Rome*, but he ought to send Commissioners to the Places. And this they did so much the more willingly, because the Person who had been put in his Place was dead, as *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Rheims* observes in the 5th. Article against his Nephew *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*.

The Conclusion of the Contest of Rothadus.

CHAP. IV.

A Relation of the Contest between Hincmarus and Wulfadus, and other Clerks ordained by Ebbo, who had been Archbishop of Rheims.

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Wulfadus.

The Council of Soissons.

HINC MARUS had no better Success in the Contest with *Wulfadus*, and some other Clerks ordain'd by *Ebbo*, after the Deposition of him from his Archbishoprick, than he had in the former with *Rothadus*. The Story is this; *Hincmarus*, then Archbishop of *Rheims*, having observed that there were some Clerks in his Diocese ordain'd by *Ebbo*, after he was degraded, would not permit them to execute their Office of Priest in the Church, nor acknowledge them as Clerks lawfully ordain'd. These Men seeing this, appealed to the Council held at *Soissons*, in the Monastery of *St. Medardus*, in April, 853. in which *Hincmarus* presided with *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens*, *Paul* Bishop of *Rouen*, and *Amauri* Bishop of *Tours*, and at which also *Thierry* Bishop of *Cambray*, *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, *Lupus* Bishop of *Chalons*, *Immo* Bishop of *Noion*, *Erpwin* Bishop of *Scalis*, *Hermenfridus* Bishop of *Beauvais*, *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*, *Hilmeradus* Bishop of *Amiens*, *Hubert* Bishop of *Meaux*, *Agius* Bishop of *Orleans*, *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, *Herimarus* Bishop of *Nevers*, *Jonas* Bishop of *Autun*, *Godefaldus* Bishop of *Chalon* upon the *Saone*, *Dodo* Bishop of *Angers*, *Gontbertus* Bishop of *Evreux*, *Hildebrandus* Bishop of *Seez*, *Erloinus* Bishop of *Contance*, *Balfredus* Bishop of *Baieux*, *Herrardus* Bishop of *Lizieux*, *Ansegendus* Bishop of *Auranches*, *Breindigus* Bishop of *Maion*, *Launus* Bishop of *Angouleme*, *Rhitbol* Suffragan of *Rheims*, several Priests, Abbots, Deacons and Clerks, were present, with *Carolus Calvus* himself. These Prelates being assembled, and treating about several Matters, *Sigloardus*, who supplied the Place of the Archdeacon of the Church of *Rheims*, told them, That there were several Clergymen standing at the Door and desired admittance. They asked him their Names, who told them, That they were *Rodoaldus*, *Gistaldus*, *Wulfadus*, *Fredibertus*, Canons of the Church of *Rheims*,

Sigismund a Monk of the Monastery of *St. Thierry*, and three others of the Monastery of *St. Remigius*. The Council, and Prince ordered them to come in, and *Hincmarus* immediately asked them their Business. They answered, That they came to desire that they might be restored to their Priestly Function, to which they had been admitted by *Ebbo*, but had been suspended from the Exercise of it by *Hincmarus*. *Hincmarus* asked them, Whether they had a Petition in Writing. They answered, No. Whereupon he told them, that in Ecclesiastical Affairs 'tis usual to use Instruments and Records. That the *Catechumens* gave in their Names in Writing when they required Baptism. That the Elections of Bishops were confirmed by an Instrument signed by the Electors. That a Bishop when he was ordained received Letters Testimonial of his Ordination. That all Accusations, Judicial Sentences, Excommunications, and Admissions to Communion were performed by publick Records, and so they ought to prefer their Petition subscribed by their Hands, that they may determine about their Demands. Therefore they drew up a Petition immediately, and presented it to the 3. Archbishops the Presidents of the Council. *Hincmarus* reading it over, and perceiving that *Wulfadus's* Name was not to it, because he understood he was sick in the Monastery, he sent a Request to him by his Messengers to sign it as the others had done, which he did. When it was brought back, *Hincmarus* said, that if their Complaint had been made against any Bishop, it had belonged to him to judge of it, but being made against that Sentence which he had passed upon them, the Determination ought to be referred to Judges chosen by both Parties according to the Canon of the Council of *Africa*, confirmed in the first Book of the Synodal Articles of the Emperor *Charles the Great*, Chap. 43. Whereupon he delivered a Writing,

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Wulfadus.

Writing, in which he declared, that he chooses for his Judges in that Cause *Wenilo* Archbishop of Sens, *Amanri* Archbishop of Tours, and *Pardulus* Bishop of Laon, who should have his place in the Judgment, without any prejudice to the Primacy of the Church of Rheims, to his own Rights, and the Respect due to the Apostolick See. After which he retired, and *Pardulus* took his place. The Complainants were then allowed to choose either the same Judges or others, or to add whom they pleased to them. Whereupon they chose the same, adding only *Prudentius* Bishop of Troyes, against whom *Hincmarus* had nothing to object. *Wulfadus* also consented to this Election, and so the first Action or Session of this Synod ended.

In the second, the Judges declared first of all, that if *Ebbo* had ordained these Clerks before he was deposed, or since his Deposition was declared unjust and his Restoration Canonical, there had been no dispute, but that they ought to exercise their Priestly Office. But since those that ordained *Hincmarus* have proved that *Ebbo* was justly deposed, and that he never was Canonically restored, and that he had the boldness to ordain these Clerks after his Deposition, it is evident, that they neither can nor ought to exercise their Function. Then *Thierry* Bishop of Cambrai presented the Acts of the Deposition of *Ebbo*, by which it appears, that he was deposed after he had owned his fault, that he had himself consented to his Degradation, and had notice given him not to exercise any Episcopal Function. It was also set down in the Book of these Acts, that Pope *Sergius* had confirmed his Condemnation, and ordered him to be allowed only a Lay-communion; that since he had not been Canonically restored, but had dared to exercise his Priestly Function, of which he had been justly divested.

In the third Action, *Hincmarus's* Ordination was examined. *Rothadus* Bishop of Soissons brought the Testimonial of his Election, signed by the Clergy and People. *Hincmarus* himself presented his Letters of Ordination, a Letter of the French Bishops, and the King's Letters signed and sealed, by which his Ordination was confirmed.

In the fourth Session therefore they concluded, that *Hincmarus* was lawfully ordained Archbishop of Rheims, and began to examine the Validity of the Ordinations made by *Ebbo*. *Immo* Bishop of Noyon cited a Decretal of Pope *Innocent*, that they can't receive Orders from them who have no power to ordain.

Whereupon it was in conclusion resolved upon and determined unanimously, in the fifth Session, that all that *Ebbo* had done after his Deposition, except Baptism, was null and void; and all those who had been ordained by him should be deprived of their Orders in what place soever they were. Then *Fredelbert*, who was one of the Canons ordained by *Ebbo*, hearing this Sentence, said, that he was ordained by that Bishop, because he saw the Suffragans of the Archbishop of Rheims, of whom *Rothadus* Bishop of Soissons was one, were come to Rheims by the Order of *Lotharius*, and had restored *Ebbo*. To prove this, he produced a Letter signed by eight Bishops. It was proved that these Subscriptions were forged, and *Immo* who was among them, and therefore concerned to clear this Matter, declared, that these Clerks being excommunicated had no right to accuse a Bishop, but to satisfy the Council and Prince, he presented a Record, by which it appeared, that the Suffragans of Rheims had declared, that they ought not to have any thing to do with *Ebbo* after his Deposition. He adds, that what was said in that Letter of the Staffs and Rings which they affirm that *Ebbo* had given (to three Bishops ordained in his absence) was absolutely false, and that those Men who dare so boldly to affront and abuse the Bishops, should be punished according to the utmost Rigour allowed by the Canons.

In the sixth Action, the Cause brought against *Hincmarus* being thus decided, he resumed his place; and then they handled in particular the Validity of the Ordination of a Priest, Abbot of the Monastery of *Hautwilliers* called *Halduin*, who having been ordained Deacon by *Ebbo*, was afterwards made Priest by *Lupus* Bishop of Chalons. The Bishop excused himself, that being made Governor of the Church of Rheims during the Vacancy of that See by an Order of the Prince, this *Halduin* was presented to him by the Archdeacon of that Church to be ordained Priest; the Synod judged, that conformable to the Canons of the Council of Nice and Sardica, the Priest *Halduin* ought to be deposed.

In the seventh Action it was demanded, how they ought to be dealt with who had communicated in the Sacrament and Prayer with *Ebbo*, because the Canons had ordered, that such ought to be excommunicated, especially if they knew that he was deposed. *Erpuin* shewed, that according to the Canons they might be favoured so far as to enjoy Communion still, if they acknowledged their fault.

Hereupon, in the eighth Session, the King desired of *Hincmarus*, that the Clerks which had been ordained by *Ebbo*, and those who had communicated with him, should be granted Lay-communion, which the Council consented to, and when they had begged pardon of their fault, and acknowledged it, it was allowed them. Thus was the Judgment of this Affair managed in the Council, as the Acts of

it relate more at large, the substance of which is contained in the first of the Canons.

Hincmarus being desirous to make this Sentence irrevocable, used his utmost endeavours to get it confirmed by the Pope. And to this end wrote several Letters to *Leo IV.* but he refused to approve the Acts of this Council, because they were not sent by some of the Bishops who were at the Council, and because he had heard that some of the Persons who were deposed had appealed to the Holy See. Nevertheless *Hincmarus* was still urgent to have the Judgment confirmed, and the Clerks who were concerned in this matter carried their Complaints to Rome, inasmuch, that *Leo IV.* having regard to what Pope *Nicholas* had written about it, sent the Bishop of *Spoletum* his Legate, to hold a Council in which the Case should be decided between the Parties at difference, upon Condition nevertheless, that if the Deposition of the Clerks was confirmed, they should have liberty to appeal to Rome. This was not executed, but, *Leo* being dead, *Hincmarus* addressed his Successor *Benedict*, and having desired the confirmation of those Privileges granted by the Popes to the Archbishops of Rheims, prayed him also to confirm what had been done against *Wulfadus* and the other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, shewing him in what manner that Judgment had been passed. *Benedict* answered him, that if the Business was so managed as he had related, and as it was set down in the Acts of the Council, he would confirm their Decision with the Apostolick Authority, and would make it to remain in force.

Pope *Nicholas*, who not long after succeeded *Benedict*, confirmed the Privileges granted to *Hincmarus* in the same form, but afterwards being changed in his affections towards *Hincmarus* and being solicited by *Wulfadus* and his Fellows, he resolved to review this Affair, and to write to *Hincmarus* to shew those Clerks some favour, to restore them, or to have their Cause re-examined in a Council of Bishops which should meet at Soissons, and at which *Remigius* Archbishop of Lyons, *Ado* Archbishop of Vienna, and *Wenilo* of Sens should be present, with the Archbishops and Bishops of France and Neustria, where *Hincmarus* and the Bishops of his Province should meet, and *Wulfadus* and the Clerks in the same Cause, should be summoned: That the whole Matter being examined, they should determine as they thought fit concerning the Restoration of those Clerks, but if they shall appeal to the Holy See, or desire to be judged there, both Parties should come to Rome, or send their Deputies after the Council, which should begin the 16th. of August. In fine, That it ought not to be pleaded in excuse, that those Clerks having not appealed in the year ought not to be received; for besides that this exception is not in the Canons which speak of Appeals to the Holy See, those Clerks did appeal to Pope *Leo* within the year concerning the Judgment given against them, as appears by a Letter of that Pope which he had by him. Wherefore he exhorts *Hincmarus* not to be severe with those Clerks. He answers also to what might be alledged, that he had the Grants of the Holy See, by which this Judgment was confirmed, by saying, that if he read them attentively, he would find, that the final Decision of that Controversie was reserved to the Holy See, which maintains the Rights of other Churches without lessening its own. This Letter of Pope *Nicholas's* is dated April 2. Indict. 14. Anno 866. *Hincmarus* at the same time wrote a Letter to *Herard* Archbishop of Tours, and to other Archbishops that were to be at that Council, and prayed King *Charles the Bald* to call it together. This Prince answered, that he would cause the Council to be holden, but withall, that he had designed to make *Wulfadus* Archbishop of Bourges, in the place of *Rodolphus* who was lately dead; that he had been chosen by the Bishops and People of the Diocese, but that he dare not let him be ordained before his restoration, till he had written to him about it; that he desired he might be ordained Priest, and then Bishop, or if he would not do it till the Synod was met, that he would permit the Government of that Church to be left to him. The Pope wrote to this Prince, that he should not do any thing concerning *Wulfadus* till his Cause was examined and judged in the Synod.

This Synod therefore met in Aug. 866. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of Rheims presented four Petitions or Memoirs to it in his own defence. In the first he shews, that *Wulfadus* and those that had been ordained by *Ebbo* after his Deposition were declared deprived of their Holy Orders by the Judgment of a Council of five Provinces, and by the Judges they themselves had pitched upon; That afterward he had himself, by the Order of the Council, given an account of the Matter at Rome, and that the Judgment of the Synod had been confirmed there by Pope *Benedict*, and also *Nicholas*; That he did not envy the Happiness of these Clerks in the least; That he was troubled they were degraded after such a manner, and wished they might be restored, but he neither dare, nor could do it after the Judgment of the Synod, it being expressly forbidden by the Canons, and Decretals of the Popes, who had several times declared, that they

the Popes. *Hincmarus* also in this Letter assures the Pope, that they had sent their Deputies to *Rome* in their stead, not to accuse *Rothadus*, but only to satisfy him, that the Bishops of *France* intended no Manner of Disrespect to the Holy See in judging him, and to certify the Pope, that that Bishop was condemned by those Bishops whom he chose for his Judges. But tho' *Hincmarus* had promised, in the Name of the *French* Bishops, to send their Deputies to *Rome*, nevertheless they did not go, and pretended, for an Excuse, that it was told them that the Ways were not open, and they should be stopped in their Journey if they went. Wherefore *Rothadus* went alone, and having waited almost eight Months for his Accusers, he presented a Petition to the Pope, in which he complains, That he had been deposed in contempt of his Appeal to the Holy See. He maintains, that he never desisted from his Appeal, nor did choose nor demand any other Judges. He accuseth *Hincmarus* of Compulsion and Deceit. He complains of his ill Usage which he had received from him, and prayed the Pope to try him.

Nicholas, who had entertain'd him civilly, and dealt with him as a Bishop, declared himself wholly for him, and made an Oration in *St. Mary's Church* upon the Eve of the Nativity, 865. in which he pleaded *Rothadus's* Cause, and maintains, That having appealed to the Holy See, he could not choose any other Judges, nor be judged at another Tribunal; that he had not done it. And lastly, Since if he had not appealed, they could not have deposed him without acquainting the Bishop of *Rome* with it, because the Canons reserve the Knowledge of such Causes as concern the Bishops to the Holy See: He declares him innocent, and dissuades the Judgment given against him, and restores him to his Dignity; and after he had done it, with great Noise, upon a solemn Day, he makes it known to the Clergy and People of *Rome* in a Letter on purpose. He sent also an Express to *Carolus Calvus*, in which he much blames the Proceedings of *Hincmarus* in derogation of the Right which he pretended to belong to the Bishop of *Rome*, without whose Cognizance they could not judge a Bishop. He complains of the Delays which they had made for above two Years, keeping *Rothadus* from *Rome*, and neither sending their Deputies, Witnesses, nor Accusers. He declares *Rothadus* innocent, and desires the King, *Charles the Bald*, to see him restored to his Dignity and Estate. At the same time he wrote a Letter to *Hincmarus*, in which, after he had upbraided him with the same Dealings, he commands him to submit to the Judgment he had given in favour of *Rothadus*, and to execute it, or come himself to accuse him, upon Condition, nevertheless, that *Rothadus* should be first restored to his Dignity and Revenues. In Conclusion he says, That if he did not do one of them, he pronounced him, by Virtue of his Apostolick Authority, deposed from his Priestly

Dignity, and separated from the Communion of the Church, without Hopes of Restoration. He wrote also a large Letter to all the Bishops, to oblige them to receive *Rothadus*, and approve the Judgment he had given in his Favour; and taking this Occasion to greaten his Authority, he claims, as his due, that all Causes of the Bishops should be brought to the Holy See. He upholds this Pretence by the false Decretals, which he vouches to be genuine, ancient, and very authentick; and because the Causes of the Bishops are the greatest Causes, whose Cognizance belongs to the Bishop of *Rome*, according to the Constitutions of the Popes. He proves that *Rothadus* made no Choice of his Judges, because he named none in particular, but had only written to some Bishops that they would undertake his Defence; that he never renounced his Appeal, nor indeed could he, because having once appealed to a superior Tribunal, he can't be judged at an inferior. Nevertheless, he declares that he will do no Injustice to any Man, and gave them free Liberty to accuse him before the Holy See, upon Condition they should first restore him, and put him in the same Quality he was in before their Sentence passed upon him. He wrote also to the Clergy and People of *Soissons*, to congratulate the Restoration of their Bishop, and exhorts them to receive him joyfully. Lastly, he gave *Rothadus* a Letter directed to him, in which he restores him to his Dignity and Revenues, forbids all Men to trouble him, exhorts him to take care of his Bishoprick, and execute his Episcopal Functions diligently, (upon Condition nevertheless, that if after he is restored, any one shall accuse him before the Holy See, he shall be ready to defend himself) and pronounced a Sentence of Excommunication against them, who, after three Admonitions, would not restore any Goods, that belong to the Church of *Soissons*, which they had invaded, and against them who communicated with such. This Letter is dated January, Indict. 13. An. 866. [These Epistles of Pope *Nicholas*, with many others, are printed in one Collection at *Rome*, 1542. and in Tom. 8. of the Councils, p. 268, 480, 514, and 563.]

Rothadus furnished with all these Letters returned into *France*. The Bishops of that Kingdom seeing the Pope so earnest in that Affair, would not contend with him, but for Peace sake restored *Rothadus*, altho' they were persuaded that the Pope did not act according to the Canons, which appoint that Bishops should be judged in the Province, and that their Causes should not be carried to *Rome*, but he ought to send Commissioners to the Places. And this they did so much the more willingly, because the Person who had been put in his Place was dead, as *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Rheims* observes in the 5th. Article against his Nephew *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*.

CHAP. IV.

A Relation of the Contest between *Hincmarus* and *Wulfadus*, and other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, who had been Archbishop of *Rheims*.

HINCMARUS had no better Success in the Contest with *Wulfadus*, and some other Clerks ordain'd by *Ebbo*, after the Deposition of him from his Archbishoprick, than he had in the former with *Rothadus*. The Story is this; *Hincmarus*, then Archbishop of *Rheims*, having observed that there were some Clerks in his Diocese ordain'd by *Ebbo*, after he was degraded, would not permit them to execute their Office of Priest in the Church, nor acknowledge them as Clerks lawfully ordain'd. These Men seeing this, appealed to the Council held at *Soissons*, in the Monastery of *St. Medardus*, in April, 853. in which *Hincmarus* presided with *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens*, *Paul* Bishop of *Rouen*, and *Amauri* Bishop of *Tours*, and at which also *Thierry* Bishop of *Cambray*, *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, *Lupus* Bishop of *Chalons*, *Immo* Bishop of *Noion*, *Erpwin* Bishop of *Senlis*, *Hermenfridus* Bishop of *Beauvais*, *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*, *Hilmeradus* Bishop of *Amiens*, *Hubert* Bishop of *Meaux*, *Agius* Bishop of *Orleans*, *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, *Herimarus* Bishop of *Nevers*, *Jonas* Bishop of *Autun*, *Godefaldus* Bishop of *Chalon* upon the *Saone*, *Dodo* Bishop of *Angers*, *Gontbertus* Bishop of *Evreux*, *Hildebrandus* Bishop of *Seez*, *Erloinus* Bishop of *Contance*, *Balfredus* Bishop of *Baieux*, *Herrardus* Bishop of *Lizieux*, *Ansegandus* Bishop of *Auranches*, *Breindigus* Bishop of *Maion*, *Launus* Bishop of *Angouleme*, *Rhitbol* Suffragan of *Rheims*, several Priests, Abbots, Deacons and Clerks, were present, with *Carolus Calvus* himself. These Prelates being assembled, and treating about several Matters, *Sigloardus*, who supplied the Place of the Archdeacon of the Church of *Rheims*, told them, That there were several Clergymen standing at the Door and desired admittance. They asked him their Names, who told them, That they were *Rodoaldus*, *Gislaldus*, *Wulfadus*, *Fredebertus*, Canons of the Church of *Rheims*,

Sigismund a Monk of the Monastery of *St. Thierry*, and three others of the Monastery of *St. Remigius*. The Council, and Prince ordered them to come in, and *Hincmarus* immediately asked them their Business. They answered, That they came to desire that they might be restored to their Priestly Function, to which they had been admitted by *Ebbo*, but had been suspended from the Exercise of it by *Hincmarus*. *Hincmarus* asked them, Whether they had a Petition in Writing. They answered, No. Whereupon he told them, that in Ecclesiastical Affairs 'tis usual to use Instruments and Records. That the *Catechumens* gave in their Names in Writing when they required Baptism. That the Elections of Bishops were confirmed by an Instrument signed by the Electors. That a Bishop when he was ordained received Letters Testimonial of his Ordination. That all Accusations, Judicial Sentences, Excommunications, and Admissions to Communion were performed by publick Records, and so they ought to prefer their Petition subscribed by their Hands, that they may determine about their Demands. Therefore they drew up a Petition immediately, and presented it to the 3. Archbishops the Presidents of the Council. *Hincmarus* reading it over, and perceiving that *Wulfadus's* Name was not to it, because he understood he was sick in the Monastery, he sent a Request to him by his Messengers to sign it as the others had done, which he did. When it was brought back, *Hincmarus* said, that if their Complaint had been made against any Bishop, it had belonged to him to judge of it, but being made against that Sentence which he had passed upon them, the Determination ought to be referred to Judges chosen by both Parties according to the Canon of the Council of *Africa*, confirmed in the first Book of the Synodal Articles of the Emperor *Charles the Great*, Chap. 43. Whereupon he delivered a Writing,

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and Wulfadus. Writing, in which he declared, that he chooses for his Judges in that Cause *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens*, *Amanri* Archbishop of *Tours*, and *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*, who should have his place in the Judgment, without any prejudice to the Primacy of the Church of *Rheims*, to his own Rights, and the Respect due to the Apostolick See. After which he retired, and *Pardulus* took his place. The Complainants were then allowed to choose either the same Judges or others, or to add whom they pleased to them. Whereupon they chose the same, adding only *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, against whom *Hincmarus* had nothing to object. *Wulfadus* also consented to this Election, and so the first Action or Session of this Synod ended.

In the second, the Judges declared first of all, that if *Ebbo* had ordained these Clerks before he was deposed, or since his Deposition was declared unjust and his Restoration Canonical, there had been no dispute, but that they ought to exercise their Priestly Office. But since those that ordained *Hincmarus* have proved that *Ebbo* was justly deposed, and that he never was Canonically restored, and that he had the boldness to ordain these Clerks after his Deposition, it is evident, that they neither can nor ought to exercise their Function. Then *Thierry* Bishop of *Cambray* presented the Acts of the Deposition of *Ebbo*, by which it appears, that he was deposed after he had owned his fault, that he had himself consented to his Degradation, and had notice given him not to exercise any Episcopal Function. It was also set down in the Book of these Acts, that Pope *Sergius* had confirmed his Condemnation, and ordered him to be allowed only a Lay-communion; that since he had not been Canonically restored, but had dared to exercise his Priestly Function, of which he had been justly divested.

In the third Action, *Hincmarus*'s Ordination was examined. *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons* brought the Testimonial of his Election, signed by the Clergy and People. *Hincmarus* himself presented his Letters of Ordination, a Letter of the French Bishops, and the King's Letters signed and sealed, by which his Ordination was confirmed.

In the fourth Session therefore they concluded, that *Hincmarus* was lawfully ordained Archbishop of *Rheims*, and began to examine the Validity of the Ordinations made by *Ebbo*. *Immo* Bishop of *Noyon* cited a Decretal of Pope *Innocent*, that they can't receive Orders from them who have no power to ordain.

Whereupon it was in conclusion resolved upon and determined unanimously, in the fifth Session, that all that *Ebbo* had done after his Deposition, except Baptism, was null and void, and all those who had been ordained by him should be deprived of their Orders in what place soever they were. Then *Frederebert*, who was one of the Canons ordained by *Ebbo*, hearing this Sentence, said, that he was ordained by that Bishop, because he saw the Suffragans of the Archbishop of *Rheims*, of whom *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons* was one, were come to *Rheims* by the Order of *Lotharius*, and had restored *Ebbo*. To prove this, he produced a Letter signed by eight Bishops. It was proved that these Subscriptions were forged, and *Immo* who was among them, and therefore concerned to clear this Matter, declared, that these Clerks being excommunicated had no right to accuse a Bishop, but to satisfy the Council and Prince, he presented a Record, by which it appeared, that the Suffragans of *Rheims* had declared, that they ought not to have any thing to do with *Ebbo* after his Deposition. He adds, that what was said in that Letter of the Staffs and Rings which they affirm that *Ebbo* had given (to three Bishops ordained in his absence) was absolutely false, and that those Men who dare so boldly to affront and abuse the Bishops, should be punished according to the utmost Rigour allowed by the Canons.

In the sixth Action, the Cause brought against *Hincmarus* being thus decided, he resumed his place; and then they handled in particular the Validity of the Ordination of a Priest, Abbot of the Monastery of *Hautvilliers* called *Halduin*, who having been ordained Deacon by *Ebbo*, was afterwards made Priest by *Lupus* Bishop of *Chalons*. The Bishop excused himself, that being made Governor of the Church of *Rheims* during the Vacancy of that See by an Order of the Prince, this *Halduin* was presented to him by the Archdeacon of that Church to be ordained Priest; the Synod judged, that conformable to the Canons of the Council of *Nice* and *Sardica*, the Priest *Halduin* ought to be deposed.

In the seventh Action it was demanded, how they ought to be dealt with who had communicated in the Sacrament and Prayer with *Ebbo*, because the Canons had ordered, that such ought to be excommunicated, especially if they knew that he was deposed. *Erpuin* shewed, that according to the Canons they might be favoured so far as to enjoy Communion still, if they acknowledged their fault.

Hereupon, in the eighth Session, the King desired of *Hincmarus*, that the Clerks which had been ordained by *Ebbo*, and those who had communicated with him, should be granted Lay-communion, which the Council consented to, and when they had begged pardon of their fault, and acknowledged it, it was allowed them. Thus was the Judgment of this Affair managed in the Council, as the Acts of it relate more at large, the substance of which is contained in the first of the Canons.

Hincmarus being desirous to make this Sentence irrevocable, used his utmost endeavours to get it confirmed by the Pope. And to this end wrote several Letters to *Leo* the Pope. And to this end wrote several Letters to *Leo* IV. but he refused to approve the Acts of this Council, because they were not sent by some of the Bishops who were at the Council, and because he had heard that some of the Persons who were deposed had appealed to the Holy See. Nevertheless *Hincmarus* was still urgent to have the Judgment confirmed, and the Clerks who were concerned in this matter carried their Complaints to *Rome*, in so much, that *Leo* IV. having regard to what Pope *Nicholas* had written about it, sent the Bishop of *Spoletum* his Legate, to hold a Council in which the Case should be decided between the Parties at difference, upon Condition nevertheless, that if the Deposition of the Clerks was confirmed, they should have liberty to appeal to *Rome*. This was not executed, but, *Leo* being dead, *Hincmarus* addressed his Successor *Benedict*, and having desired the confirmation of those Privileges granted by the Popes to the Archbishops of *Rheims*, prayed him also to confirm what had been done against *Wulfadus* and the other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, shewing him in what manner that Judgment had been passed. *Benedict* answered him, that if the Business was so managed as he had related, and as it was set down in the Acts of the Council, he would confirm their Decision with the Apostolick Authority, and would make it to remain in force.

Pope *Nicholas*, who not long after succeeded *Benedict*, confirmed the Privileges granted to *Hincmarus* in the same form, but afterwards being changed in his affections towards *Hincmarus* and being solicited by *Wulfadus* and his Fellows, he resolved to review this Affair, and to write to *Hincmarus* to shew those Clerks some favour, to restore them, or to have their Cause re-examined in a Council of Bishops which should meet at *Soissons*, and at which *Remigius* Archbishop of *Lyons*, *Ado* Archbishop of *Vienna*, and *Wenilo* of *Sens* should be present, with the Archbishops and Bishops of *France* and *Neustria*, where *Hincmarus* and the Bishops of his Province should meet, and *Wulfadus* and the Clerks in the same Cause, should be summoned: That the whole Matter being examined, they should determine as they thought fit concerning the Restoration of those Clerks, but if they shall appeal to the Holy See, or desire to be judged there, both Parties should come to *Rome*, or send their Deputies after the Council, which should begin the 16th. of August. In fine, That it ought not to be pleaded in excuse, that those Clerks having not appealed in the year ought not to be received; for besides that this exception is not in the Canons which speak of Appeals to the Holy See, those Clerks did appeal to Pope *Leo* within the year concerning the Judgment given against them, as appears by a Letter of that Pope which he had by him. Wherefore he exhorts *Hincmarus* not to be severe with those Clerks. He answers also to what might be alledged, that he had the Grants of the Holy See, by which this Judgment was confirmed, by saying, that if he read them attentively, he would find, that the final Decision of that Controversie was reserved to the Holy See, which maintains the Rights of other Churches without lessening its own. This Letter of Pope *Nicholas*'s is dated April 2. Indict. 14. Anno 866. *Hincmarus* at the same time wrote a Letter to *Herard* Archbishop of *Tours*, and to other Archbishops that were to be at that Council, and prayed King *Charles the Bald* to call it together. This Prince answered, that he would cause the Council to be holden, but withall, that he had designed to make *Wulfadus* Archbishop of *Bourges*, in the place of *Rodolphus* who was lately dead; that he had been chosen by the Bishops and People of the Diocese, but that he dare not let him be ordained before his restoration, till he had written to him about it; that he desired he might be ordained Priest, and then Bishop, or if he would not do it till the Synod was met, that he would permit the Government of that Church to be left to him. The Pope wrote to this Prince, that he should not do any thing concerning *Wulfadus* till his Cause was examined and judged in the Synod.

This Synod therefore met in Aug. 866. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* presented four Petitions or Memoirs to it in his own defence. In the first he shews, that *Wulfadus* and those that had been ordained by *Ebbo* after his Deposition were declared deprived of their Holy Orders by the Judgment of a Council of five Provinces, and by the Judges themselves had pitched upon; That afterward he had himself, by the Order of the Council, given an account of the Matter at *Rome*, and that the Judgment of the Synod had been confirmed there by Pope *Benedict*, and also *Nicholas*; That he did not envy the Happiness of these Clerks in the least; That he was troubled they were degraded after such a manner, and wished they might be restored, but he neither dare, nor could do it after the Judgment of the Synod, it being expressly forbidden by the Canons, and Decretals of the Popes, who had several times declared, that they

could

The Council of Soissons. 866.

Of the
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus and
Wulfadus.

could not themselves annul the Canons made by the Councils, and approved by their Predecessors. The second Memoir concerns the Person of *Ebbo*. *Hincmarus* proves by the Pope's Letters, that *Ebbo* owned his Crime, and was deposed by 44 Bishops, whose Judgment was afterward confirmed and approved by Pope *Sergius*, who had ordered him to content himself with a Lay-Communion, and since he was not afterward Canonically restored, he ought not to be looked upon as a Bishop after his Condemnation, and that at this time it ought not in the least to be questioned, because this Judgment being passed in 835, he had a prescription of above 30 years against him. They alledged, that notwithstanding his Deposition he had continued to execute his Episcopal Function to his Death. *Hincmarus* replies, that this unwarrantable Action was of no use to him, and that the number of those that approved it could not justify his Carriage, which was so opposite to the Laws of the Church; That it was contrary to all the Canonical Rules for him to exercise all the Offices of a Bishop in the Church of *Mayence*, for the Canons do not permit in any case whatsoever a Bishop who is deprived of his own Diocese to exercise the Episcopal Function in another. *Hincmarus* then shews, that his own Ordination was Canonical and Lawful, saying, that after the Deposition of *Ebbo*, *Fulcus* took care of the Church of *Rheims* for 9 years, in which time *Ebbo* did not claim his Dignity again, nor make any opposition to him. That *Nevo* had done the same for a year and a half, without any demand of restoration from *Ebbo*. That as for himself he was afterward ordained in the Synod of the Province of *Rheims* held at *Beauvais*, being desired by the People and Clergy of the City, and by the Bishops of the Province, with the consent of the Abbot and Monks of the Monastery of which he was a Member. That he was put in possession of it without any opposition from any Man. That his Ordination was approved by the Bishops of *France*, who wrote about it to Pope *Sergius*, and confirmed by an Edict of King *Charles the Bald*. That all these Acts were sent to *Leo IV*. *Sergius* being dead in the mean time. That *Lotharius* himself having in vain solicited Pope *Sergius* to have *Ebbo* restored, agreed to his Ordination; That the Holy See had allowed it, and *Leo IV*. had granted him the Pall, and had writ to him several Letters; That Pope *Benedict* and Pope *Nicholas* had confirmed him by granting him his Privileges. Lastly, That he was not obliged to enter into any dispute about it with any Man, since *Nicholas* had not required of him an account of his Ordination of him. Lastly, having confirmed that which had passed in the Affair of the Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, it belonged to the Bishops to direct what they thought just and regular to satisfy the Pope; That as for himself he would not oppose what they did; That if it were necessary he would explain the Business more at large, and would shew them the Reasons, why they suspended these Clerks at the Synod of *Meaux*, and degraded them quite in the Council of *Soissons*. Then he presented to the Synod the Acts of the Council of *Soissons*, with those of the Synod of *Bourges*, and the Privileges of the Popes *Benedict* and *Nicholas*.

Hincmarus also presented a 3d. Petition, in which after he had set down such Canons and Passages in the Popes Letters, as made it appear, that sometimes Clemency had been used towards them whose Ordinations were dubious, he consented for Peace sake, and to satisfy the Pope, that some gentle Method might be found out to receive and promote to Holy Orders those who had been ordained by *Ebbo*, yet with a due care that this fact might not prejudice the Canons of the Church, nor the Judgment given against them and against *Ebbo*.

The Fourth Memoir of *Hincmarus* was presented to the Council, but not read, for fear of offending some Persons in the Council. It shews, that it was against his Will, that he was forced to declare, that *Wulfadus*, after he had been condemned by the Council of *Soissons*, without the consent of the Bishops of that Council, without any authority from the Holy See, and without consulting the Church of *Rheims*, had left the Province wherein he was baptized, had received the Tonsure of a Clerk, and had executed the Office of a Reader, to go into the Church of *Langres*, which was then vacant, that he might be ordained a Bishop there. That he had possessed himself of the Revenues of that Church, which according to the Council of *Chalcedon*, ought to have been kept by the Steward for the next Bishop. That having been removed by the Order of the Synod, he had made an Oath that he would never attempt the like again, nor undertake any Ecclesiastical Function for the future. That he had delivered this Declaration in Writing in the presence of *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*, *Gontbertus* Bishop of *Eureux*, and *Aeneas* Bishop of *Paris*, before the King, and several Judges chosen by the Synod. That an Oath and Declaration had been required of him, as the Popes had decreed, to prevent a change of his resolution. And that it was for the same cause, that he had desired Pope *Nicholas* to confirm the Judgment given against him in the Council of *Soissons*, which had been already confirmed by his Predecessor *Benedict*. That he did not say this out of Malice, or with a de-

sign to do *Wulfadus* any Injury, nor to hinder the effect of the Pope's good will towards him, but only to inform the Council fully of what had passed in that Affair.

After so full an Information, the Bishops of the Council were of the Opinion, that the Synod of *Soissons* had judged rightly; That *Hincmarus* had good reason not to restore these Clerks in contempt of the Decrees of that Council; That they might nevertheless be restored without injuring the Authority of the Council of *Soissons* confirmed by the Holy See, by granting them to continue in their Orders by Favour and Dispensation, and so succeed the Bishops when they died. But they thought it not convenient for them to do it by their own Authority, and judged it best for the Pope to do it by his. Wherefore they wrote to him, and assured him, that they had followed and executed his Orders; and that it might not be thought that they had revoked what was decreed in the Council of *Soissons*, *Herardus* Archbishop of *Tours* made a solemn Protestation in the Council in all their Names, that they would never alter their Opinion, but only would consent, that the Judgment which had been given in strictness of Justice, might by a merciful Charity be moderated, and sweetened. Seven Archbishops were at this Council, viz. *Hincmarus* of *Rheims*, *Remigius* of *Lyons*, *Trotarius* of *Bourdeaux*, *Herardus* of *Tours*, *Wenilo* of *Rouen*, *Egilo* of *Sens*, *Liutbert* of *Mayence*, and 28 Bishops of *France*, among whom was *Rotbadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, who subscribed the Letter sent to the Pope about the Affair of *Wulfadus* and his Fellows. *Hincmarus* wrote in his own Name to Pope *Nicholas* to excuse himself, that he had not immediately restored those Clerks, because he dare not disannul what been done in a Synod of five Provinces, but that he had submitted to the Synod as he ordered him, and had consented to the Accommodation that his Brethren had found out agreeable to the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, made concerning those who had been ordained by *Meletius*; That he did not conceive it necessary for him to send a Deputy in his stead, since *Egilo* went in the Name of the Council, and the Pope had not enjoined him to come to *Rome*, or send his Deputies, unless there were an Appeal from the Judgment of the Synod, either on his own part or *Wulfadus*'s. He beseeches him to confirm what the Council had done, and assures him, that he wished no ill to *Wulfadus*, and other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, who were but nine in all, as well Canons and Monks, as City and Country Clergymen. *Charles the Bald* wrote also a Letter to the Pope, in which he commends *Hincmarus* for his Obedience, approves the Method which the Council had taken, to refer the Restoration of *Wulfadus* to the Pope, and gives him notice that he had, in the mean time left the Care of the Church of *Bourges* to him. The King, also desired of the Bishops of this Council to crown his Queen *Hermintruda*, which was granted him, and the Ceremony was performed by them at the same time in the Church of *St. Medardus*.

Egilo Archbishop of *Sens* was sent with these Letters, the Acts of the Council, and a Petition sent by *Hincmarus*, which is not met withal among his Works, in which he gives the Sum of all that he had alledged in the Council concerning the Deposition of *Ebbo*, and recites several Authorities out of the Pope's Letters, to shew, that he ought not to blame, or condemn, what has been done against that Archbishop, nor annul the Judgment given against *Wulfadus*, or the Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, but only restore them by an Act of Grace.

Pope *Nicholas* being desirous to disannul all that had been done in the first Council of *Soissons*, was not at all pleased with this Judgment, but returned a large Answer to the Bishops, in which he much blames the Transactions of that Council, and says, That the Acts of it are full of Falsities, and that they were never confirmed at *Rome* after a full knowledge of the Cause; That Pope *Leo* his Predecessor, had ordered that the Matter should be re-examined, and for that end sent his Legate to be present at the Tryal, but it was never executed, and Pope *Benedict*'s Confirmation was obtain'd by surprize by *Hincmarus*, and by a false relation of it; and besides, 'twas not Definitive, or without a Reserve; That he had advised *Hincmarus* to receive those Clerks, and in case he would not, he commanded that a Synod should do it; That he was mightily pleased that there was no difference in the Council, but they had unanimously agreed to restore *Wulfadus*, and the other Clerks; That all he complained of was, that since they had left their Restoration to him, they had not given him a full account of that Affair, and all that concerned it; That they ought to have made a Declaration at large, of all the circumstances of *Ebbo*'s Deposition, and Restoration, of his second Deprivation, and Translation to another Church; That he wished they had done it in that Cause, and would do it in all others, about which he should order a Council to be held. He approved of *Hincmarus*'s submission, but could not but smile at his assertion, That 'twas not he that had suspended them, or declared them fallen from the Orders, since he knew what he had done in his Province against them, and how eagerly he had prosecuted that Affair

Of the
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus and
Wulfadus.

pope Ni-
cholas's
Letter a-
bout the
Judgment
of the
Council of
Soissons.

at Rome, He subjoins, that the Matter being not sufficiently cleared, or examined, he could not pass his definitive Sentence upon it, but because these Clerks were deposed contrary to the Canons, they ought to be restored, and resettled for the present, till *Hincmarus* can produce what he hath against them, and prove that they have been lawfully deposed. He complains, that they had made one of those Clerks a Bishop at the same time that they pretended to leave the Judgment of the Matter to him, and declares, that he will not yield to his Ordination till the thing is ended. Lastly, in the Business of *Ebbo*, he says, that 'tis no wonder that Pope *Sergius* would not receive him to his Communion, because he was condemned, and had not appealed to the Holy See about his Condemnation, nor had his Cause been fully discovered to him, or examined. He speaks the same things to *Hincmarus* in his Letters written to him at the same time, but more especially blames his Carriage, and Administration, in many sharp reflections; and concludes, telling him, that he takes it ill that he makes use of the Pall on such occasions as were not allowable. In a third Letter, he thanks King *Charles the Bald* for the satisfaction he had given him, in making the Bishops of France unanimously join in the Restoration of those Clerks, but could not blame *Hincmarus*. Lastly, in his fourth Letter he congratulates *Wulfadus*, and the other Clerks, for their Restoration, and exhorts them to be subject to *Hincmarus*; and tells them, that he would allow them a Year's time to prosecute that Affair at Rome, if they thought fit. These four Letters bear Date Dec. 7. 866. [These Letters of Pope *Nicholas* are extant Tom. 8. of the Councils, p. 268. and 480. They are also printed with a Collection of his Epistles published at Rome 1542. Fol.]

By what has been said, it is evident that the Bishops of France would not bring these Causes to Rome, nor be obliged to appear there themselves to maintain the Justice of their Sentence, nor would endure it to be disannulled, or blamed in the least; the contrary to which, Pope *Nicholas* pretended to do. He required, that the Councils which judged any Causes at the first Hearing should be called by his Authority; that both the accused and the accusers, had liberty of Appealing to Rome, before and after their Sentence; that all Synods should give him a large and full Account of their Proceedings before they passed Sentence; that in case of Appeal, the Holy See might put the condemned into the Places and Condition they were formerly in, conditionally, and then the Judges should be obliged to come, or send their Deputies to Rome, to maintain their Judgment, where the Cause shall be examined a-new, as if it had never been decided. From this time the Bishops of France, who were most learned, and best skilled in the Canons, to evade the Pretensions contrary to the Canons, which tended directly to the utter ruining of the Episcopal Authority, and overthrow of all Church Discipline, and that without quarrelling with the Holy See, judged all Ecclesiastical Causes that came before them in their Synods; and that their Judgment might be of greater Authority, they caused the Contending Parties to choose their Judges, because, according to a Maxim of Law, it is not lawful to appeal from the Sentence of those Judges whom they had elected. Lastly, they caused that Judgment to be executed, and in case the Persons condemned referred themselves to Rome, they would send the Pope their Reasons, and require his Confirmation, or rather Approbation of their Judgment, but tho' often cited never would go to Rome, nor send their Deputies with a Commission to act in their Names, to call any Matter in Question, but left it to the Pope to do as he pleased, without opposition. And if it so happened, that they were obliged either for the good of the Church, or for Peace sake, or in Obedience to the Will of that Prince, to do as the Pope would have them, they protested that it was without any Abrogation of their Sentence, which was valid and just, but only to shew Mercy to the faulty. Thus they behaved themselves in this Cause. *Hincmarus*, first of all, caused those Clerks to present their Petition in Writing, and to leave it to the Synod of France: He then made them choose their Judges by agreement, after he had withdrawn from the Tryal. After the Judgment was passed he had it executed, and confirmed by the Pope; but at last, *Nicholas I.* being solicited to it by *Wulfadus*, and being desirous to have that Cause re-examined in a Synod, *Hincmarus* ordered the matter so, that not only their Decree was kept in force, but was confirmed without any offence to the Pope, who had resolved to restore these Clerks, or to the Emperor, who favoured *Wulfadus*; for he persuaded the Bishops not to deal so rigorously with *Wulfadus* and his Fellows, as in Justice they might, and to consent to their Restoration, if the Pope desired it. This shewed a great deal of complaisance to the Pope, in leaving the thing to his disposal, in respect to the Holy See, but it was not what the Pope desired; he would have had the Synod, which he called, to have quite disannulled what was done at *Soissons*, and himself to be made Judge in that Affair; and upon an Appeal, both Parties should have come to Rome to contest about it. And for this Reason it was that he would not de-

termine the Matter definitively, but satisfied himself to restore *Wulfadus*, and the Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*, conditionally.

Before *Nicholas's* Letters were brought by *Egilo*, *Charles the Bald*, who had so great a favour for *Wulfadus*, and would have him ordained Archbishop of *Bourges* by all means whatsoever, sent his Son *Carolomannus*, Abbot of *St. Medard*, to have him ordained and installed, which was done in September, by some Bishops who were not very well skilled in the Laws of the Church, which *Wulfadus* had provided, and *Carolomannus* had scared into it. It was *Aldo* Bishop of *Limoges* who consecrated him; and some have said, that that Bishop, in the midst of the Ceremony, was taken with a Fever, of which he died soon after. *Egilo* being returned with four Letters from Pope *Nicholas* in the Year 867, *Charles the Bald* called a Council at *Troyes*, at which were the Archbishops of *Rheims*, *Tours*, *Rouen*, *Bourdeaux*, *Sens*, and *Bourges*, with those 14 Bishops who were present at the Council of *Soissons* the Year before; in which, some Bishops favouring *Wulfadus* to please *Carolus Calvus*, would encounter *Hincmarus*, but he defended himself so well, that they only resolved to satisfy the Pope to send a Synodical Epistle, containing a large Relation of what had passed in the Deposition of *Ebbo*, his pretended Restoration, and the Ordination of *Wulfadus*, and others, who had been consecrated after his Deposition. In it they relate, how the Children of *Lewis the Godly* would have deprived him of his Estate, and for that end had made use of *Ebbo*, and some other Bishops, who having obliged that Prince to confess some forged Crimes, had put him in a State of Penance, and deprived him of his Authority; how afterwards, when *Lewis the Kind* was again restored by the Authority of his Bishops, *Ebbo* had left his See, and fled; how he was apprehended, and carried to the Emperor by *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, and by *Ercarans* Bishop of *Chalons*; how he had himself signed, and approved the Restoration of *Lewis the Kind*; and owned, that he was unjustly, and contrary to the Canons, put to Penance; after which manner having acknowledged his fault in Writing at the Council in *Thionville* held 835, in which Year *Lewis the Kind* died; how afterward *Lotharius* being come out of Italy into France, *Ebbo* met him at *Worms*, conducted by the Abbot *Boso* in the Monastery, where he then abode; how *Lotharius* having given order that he should be restored, he went to *Rheims*, and began to exercise his Episcopal Function in the presence of the Bishops of the Province, without any contradiction from them; How in that time he had ordained *Wulfadus*; and the other Clerks, about whom the Controversie was, who were told, that he was Canonically restored to his Church; How after he had enjoyed peaceably, one Year, the Archbishoprick of *Rheims*, he withdrew himself into the Kingdom of *Lotharius*, when King *Charles* had passed over the *Sequana*, and conquered the Country; How great Service he had done *Lotharius*; who gave him two Abbies, and had employed him in several Affairs, and sent him to Rome with *Drogon* Bishop of *Metz*, 844, to Pope *Sergius*, who would not acknowledge him for a Bishop; How having refused to go Ambassador into *Grece*, he fell into Disgrace with *Lotharius*, and was turned out of his Abby; How afterwards retreating into the Empire of *King Lewis of Germany*, he was made Bishop of *Hildesheim* in *Saxony*, where he exercised his Episcopal Function; How in 845, *Charles* had called a Synod at *Beauvais* to have a Bishop ordained for the Church of *Rheims*, which had been vacant ten Years, yet governed by the Abbot *Fulcus*, and after by *Notho*; How *Hincmarus* had been Canonically elected and ordained Bishop, and his Ordination had been confirmed by *Gontaldas*, whom Pope *Sergius* had appointed at the Solicitation of *Lotharius* to regulate that Affair. They joined to this Relation all that they had written to the Holy See about that Matter, and all that the Pope had given them in Command, declaring to him, that they approved the Restoration of the Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*; and consented, that they should exercise their Office. Lastly, to gratify the Emperor *Charles*, they required the Pall for *Wulfadus*, ordain'd Bishop of *Bourges*. This Letter was dated Nov. 867, and sealed up with the Archbishop's Seals, and given to *Astardus* Bishop of *Nants* to be carried to the Pope; But *Charles the Bald* made him deliver it to him; broke the Seals, read it, and wrote another to the Pope, which was more favourable to *Ebbo*, relating every thing that was for him, and concealing what was against him; He says he was the Son of a Person that belonged to the King's Treasury; that having his liberty, he had entred into the Ecclesiastick State, and was made the King's Library-Keeper; that after the Death of *Charles the Great*, in the time of *Lewis the Kind*, *Wulfarans* Archbishop of *Rheims* being dead, and it being left in the power of the People to choose whom they would Bishop, they first chose *Gillemarus*, but he being presented to the Bishops to be examined, was found incapable of it; wherefore the Emperor propounding *Ebbo* as a Person of Merit, the People agreed to choose him; that in the first Rebellion of *Lewis the Kind's* Sons, *Ebbo* continued loyal, but the second time he had

Of the Contest between *Hincmarus* and *Wulfadus*: *Wulfadus* ordained Archbishop of *Bourges*

The Council of *Troyes*:

The Letter of the Council of *Troyes* to the Pope against *Ebbo*:

King *Charles's* Letter in favour of *Ebbo*:

engaged himself, and the Party of *Lotharius*, and acknowledged his fault publicly in the Church of *St. Stephen* at *Metz*; that to prevent his Deposition, he had sent to the Empress *Judith* the Ring that she had given him; that that Princess was employed to pacify her Husband *Lewis the Kind*, and to solicit for *Ebbo*; that nevertheless, some Bishops had persuaded him to confess his fault, and after that Confession, had advised him never more to exercise his Priest's Office; that the Emperor had written to Pope *Gregory* to confirm his Deposition, and had received his Letter thereupon, but what was in it they knew not, yet *Lewis the Kind* did not seem satisfied by it, because he did not make another Archbishop upon it, which he would immediately have done, if the Pope had confirmed the Deposition of *Ebbo*; that after the Death of *Lewis the Kind*, *Ebbo* was acknowledged by all the Suffragan Bishops, Archbishop of *Rheims*; that they had all communicated with him, and all that had been ordained Bishops in his absence had received the Ring and Crozier from him, with Letters of Confirmation. This is the account that *Charles the Bald* gave the Pope in particular about the Deposition of *Ebbo*, and after excuses himself for having caused *Wulfadus* to be ordained, before he had received the Pope's Answer, and demanded the Pall for him, and commends the condition of the Bishops oppressed by the *Britains* to him.---*Hincmarus* had also written a private Letter to Pope *Nicholas*, in Answer to that which he had received from the Pope, full of reproof, and angry reflections: In it he defends himself with much submission, but as much smartness. He tells him, that he had found in the Letter written to himself, and in that to the Bishops of the Council of *Soissons*, many reproachful imputations, which he deserved for his Sins; that if he were present with him, he would do as *St. Benedict* ordered his Monks to do, when they found their Prior offended with them, cast himself upon the Earth at his feet, but what he could not do with his Body he would do with his Mind and Heart, according to the Advice of *St. Gregory*, who bids us to have Patience, and Charity in our Hearts towards our Neighbour, who is at a distance from us. In fine, that he had executed the Pope's Command in restoring *Wulfadus*, and the other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*. After he hath thus humbled himself, he assures him that he was much troubled to see him so angry with him, but he imputes that Charge to the false Reports he had received of him, and owns, that had he been really guilty of those things he is accused of, he should have deserved to be dealt withal more severely, but his Conscience testifies to him, that tho' he be a great Sinner, he is not such an one as the World hath represented him. He says, that he was heretofore accused to Pope *Sergius*, and *Leo*, that he had not that respect he ought for the Holy See, but he shewed, by his obedient Carriage, how submissive he was to the Holy See, and how far from that ambitious Spirit which was charged upon him, as well as from cruelty and falshood; that neither his own Church, nor the Neighbouring Churches, ever complained that he was subject to those Vices, and beseeches him never to believe that he hath had any design to delude him, or oppose his Orders, or despise his Admonitions; that as to *Ebbo*, he thought it not convenient to lay open his faults, lest any Man should think that he insulted over the Dead, or would revive an Affair that had been ended and determined above 30 Years. Nevertheless, to satisfy the Pope, he tells him, how he had declared himself unworthy of his Priesthood, without being constrained by violent means to it, or engaged by fraud. He takes notice, that of all the Bishops who had deposed him, there now survived but two, viz. *Rothadus* and *Erpuinus*. He then describes the manner how he was ordained into his place; how Pope *Sergius* being solicited by *Lotharius* to it, had named *Gombaldus* Archbishop of *Rouen* to examine his Ordination; how *Ebbo*, when he was summoned to the Synod by *Gombaldus* durst not appear; whence it was concluded that *Ebbo* was never restored, and should remain deposed from his Priestly Office and Dignity; and that having lost it in his Life time, he should not recover it after his Death. He next gives him an Account of the business of *Wulfadus*, and the other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo* after his Deposition; and because Pope *Nicholas* chiefly insisted upon this, that Pope *Leo* had not confirmed the first Judgment given against them at the Council of *Soissons*, *Hincmarus* gives him the particulars of all that had passed between him and Pope *Leo* in that business, viz. That Pope *Leo* had written to him that he could not confirm what had been done in that Synod, because the Council had not sent their Deputies to him, nor were his Legates present at it, nor had the Emperor writ any thing to him about it; and because 'twas said that *Wulfadus*, and the other Clerks had appealed to the Holy See. That, besides this, *Lotharius* had importuned him not to confirm the Judgment of the Council of *Soissons*; That the Bishops hearing that *Lotharius* concerned himself in that Matter, had written to him, and that he had nominated two Bishops of *Italy* to look into it in a Council, which was called by the Authority of the Holy See; that after this, that Prince had sent his Deputies to *Rome* to Pope *Leo*, who

died as they were on their Journey to him; that being arrived there in the Papacy of *Benedict*, that Pope had granted him a Grant to confirm the Judgment of the Synod of *Soissons*; that since that, neither the Bishop of *Spoletum*, nominated by *Lotharius*, nor any other Bishop, had held any other Synod about that Affair, but that which was lately called by the Authority of Pope *Nicholas*; he defends himself against that Accusation that the Pope laid against him, that he had falsified *Benedict's* Letter of Privilege, and assures him, that the Copy which he had sent him was a true one, as he will find, if he compares it with the Original Draught, which is in the Registry of the Church of *Rome*. He adds, that he had not required of the Holy See any other special Privileges, but what were usually granted to all Metropolitans, and were anciently granted to the Metropolis of *Rheims*, but because his Province, and also his Diocese, were partly in one Kingdom and part in another, he thought it necessary to have his Privileges renewed, because men had great regard to them, and carnal men being awed by such marks of distinction, respected him the more. Lastly, as to the Pall, he assures him, that he never used it unless upon the great Festivals of the Passover and Nativity, because on the other Holidays of the Year, tho' 'twas allowed for him to wear it, yet he was obliged through urgent business, and the Affairs of Church and State, to be absent from his Cathedral Church. In fine, that he desired the Pall for no particular use, because the Pall is an Ornament which is suitable for all Metropolitans, as a mark of the Dignity or Virtue of him that wears it. *Hincmarus* had composed this Letter before the Council of *Troyes*, immediately after he received *Nicholas's* Letter, but it was not sent in that form, for the Bishops of that Council having given him a large relation of the business of *Ebbo*, he cut off the beginning of his Letter, and wrote a shorter beginning with his own Ordination, and the business of *Wulfadus*. *Aetardus* Bishop of *Nants*, the Deputy of the Council to go to *Rome*, was also entrusted with another Affair by the Council of *Soissons*. 'Tis thought commonly to be that of 866, but it was another Council held there in 867, for *Aetardus*, who was the Bearer, went to *Rome* in that Year only; and Pope *Nicholas* in his Answers to the Synod, and Bishops of the Council of *Soissons* in 866, makes no mention of any thing written in this Letter. The Bishops of the last Council tell him, how the Churches of *Tours* and *Nants* were much annoyed by the *Britains*, who would not come to the Synods of the Province to which they belonged, nor acknowledge the Metropolitans and Bishops of *France*, pretending to govern themselves; that they valued not the Petitions that had been made to them; that they had encroached upon *Nants*, and attempted the same upon the Bishopricks of *Tours*, *Angers*, and *Mans*; that almost all the Churches of *Neustria* had endured much by their Cruelty; that they had deposed the Bishops of *Dola* and *Vannes*, and put other Bishops in their place; then they pray the Pope to do them Justice, to give *Aetardus* a favourable Audience, to reduce the *Britains* to good Order, and to write to their Duke, either to submit to King *Charles*, or else to make use of the Sword of Excommunication. This Letter is dated Aug. 16th.

When *Aetardus* came at *Rome* he found Pope *Nicholas* Dead, and *Adrian* settled in his place, to whom he presented the Synod and King's Letters. *Adrian* returned this Answer to the Bishops of the Synod of *Troyes*, that tho' they had omitted some things as to the Restoration of *Ebbo*, yet he commends their Zeal; that he was glad that *Wulfadus's* Innocency had been proved so clearly; that he approved of his Promotion to the Archbishoprick of *Bourges*, and granted him the Pall; that he desired him to put Pope *Nicholas's* Name into all their Dyptichs, and to oppose all that the *Greeks* might say, or attempt against this Pope. This Letter is dated Febr. 11th. 868. He sent an Answer also to the Letter of the Bishops of the Council of *Soissons*, in the beginning of which it evidently appears, that the Letter before-mentioned was not written by that Council of *Soissons* held in 866, but in another which met there in 867, before the Council of *Troyes*. He tells them, that he much pitied the condition of *Aetardus*, who was deprived and dispossessed of his Bishoprick and Orders; that he should be put (*incardinari*) into the first vacant Church, to exercise his Episcopal Function there. He says, that he had written about it to King *Charles*. And indeed, in the following Letter which is directed to that Prince, he answers first to the Letter which he had written to him concerning *Ebbo*, telling him, that 'tis to no purpose to examine the matters concerning that Bishop, who is now Dead. He thanks him for the Protection which he had given the Churchmen, which the Holy See thought fit to restore. He grants the Pall to *Wulfadus*, and recommends *Aetardus* to his Care to be put into the next vacant See, which was not less than his own. He also recommends him for the same reason to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, and *Hérard* Archbishop of *Tours*, in private Letters to them: He commands this last to give *Aetardus* an Abby, which he had heretofore in his Diocese, and tells him, that he had written to *Solomon* Duke of the *Britains*, and his People, to exhort them to do him Justice; and

and desires him to be fully assured, that if they should send any one to *Rome* on their Part, they should not obtain any thing to prejudice his Rights. He grants by another Letter the Pall to *Adardus*, to comfort him for the Loss of his

Diocefs. Thus ended the Contest between *Hincmarus* and *Wulfadus*, with the other Clerks ordained by *Ebbo*. [These Letters of Pope *Adrian* are printed among his other Epistles, which are 26. in all, in *Tom. 8. of the Councils*, p. 896.]

CHAP. V.

An History of the several Contests that *Hincmarus* Archbishop of Rheims had with his Nephew *Hincmarus* Bishop of Laon.

HINC MARUS engaged in another Business against his Nephew *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, which had no better Effects than the former. He had by his Interest and Favour made this Nephew Bishop of *Laon*, which is subject to his Metropolis, in 859. This Man instead of being subject and devoted to the Will of his Uncle, would govern according to his own Humour, and being grown into Favour at Court, accepted an Office there, and obtained an Abby. This displeased the Archbishop of *Rheims*, who did all he could to oblige him to quit them, and reproved him for leaving his Diocefs to go to his Abby without his Permission, although it was forbidden by the Canons to Bishops to leave their Province without the Consent of their Metropolitan.

The Bishop of *Laon* fearing the Presence of his Uncle, dare not be at the Synod of Bishops met at *Cambray* for the Ordination of a Bishop, although he was summoned. In 868. *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* engaged himself in a Business with *Charles the Bald*. Having some Contests with certain Laymen about the Estate of the Church, and principally with a Lord called *Normannus*, to whom the King had given a Benefice, i. e. some Lands belonging to the Church of *Laon*, with the Consent of this Bishop *Hincmarus* himself, who had himself solicited him, and procured it for him, as one of his Friends, but afterwards repenting of what he had done, and being desirous to get it again, had excommunicated that Lord. He began to discuss the Affair privately before the Commissioners, among whom were some Bishops, but it happened that the Son of *Luido* accused the Bishop of *Laon* before the King, and the Lords of his Council, of having deprived him of a Benefice of his Father's, (i. e. of a certain Manor belonging to the Church, which had of ancient times been possessed and enjoyed by his Father) although to retain the Possession and Enjoyment of it he had paid a Fine to the Church, and had gotten a Grant of him. The King complaining of these Actions to *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, he answered his Majesty with so much Impudence, that the Prince fell into a great Passion against him, and gave him many ill Words. He then summoned him to his Council, but *Hincmarus* humbly shewed him, that he could not appear, and at the same time sent a Letter to *Rome* to accuse *Normannus*, and to request the Pope to take this Matter upon him, and procure that he might come to *Rome*. *Hincmarus* hereupon was condemned for his Default by the King's Council, and all the Revenues of his Bishoprick were seized on. The King also put him out of his Office at Court and his Abby. And although *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* was very angry with him, yet he endeavoured to assist him on this Occasion, and wrote a smart Letter to *Charles the Bald*, in which he affirms, that what he had done against *Hincmarus* was altogether unjust; that it was never heard of, that a Christian Prince should confiscate the Revenues of the Church. Whereupon he recites several Laws of the Emperors and Decrees of the Councils and Popes to prove, that 'tis not allowable for any Man to invade the Church Revenues. Then he presented to the King a Memoir, which contained several Canons, to shew, that Bishops ought not to appear before Lay Judges in Matters Ecclesiastical. The King answered, that the Kings his Predecessors had compelled the Bishops to give an Account before the Lords of his Council of the Benefices they would put their Officers out of. *Hincmarus* replied by another Writing, That that Custom was an Abuse, which was reformed by the Capitularies. The King being at *Pistis* in *Normandy*, he held a Council there. *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* presented a Petition to the Bishops assembled, requiring them to settle him in his Revenues, or suffer him to shift for himself at *Rome*, but the Matter was accommodated by *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, and the Bishop of *Laon* was restored to his Place, after he had begged the King's Pardon, and so he retreated immediately into his Diocefs. *Charles the Bald* commanded him several times to come to him, but he would not obey the Order, but designed to fly into the Kingdom of *Lotharius*, who had promised to receive him into his Protection. He had also the Boldness to write to King *Charles*, that he had rather live out of his Kingdom, than to be represented such an ill Man as he was reported to be in it. The King then commanded his Domestick Servants to come

to him, some obeyed, but he detained the rest. After this the King a second time sent two Bishops to him, and some of his Guards, to bring them either by Persuasion or Force. *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* having heard that some Soldiers were coming to him, pronounced Excommunication against those that did meddle with the Revenues of his Church. The two Bishops which *Charles the Bald* had sent, having put *Hincmarus* in mind of the Oath which he had made to the King, could not persuade him to go with them to him, and therefore returned after they had obliged such Persons of his Family as were freed by an Oath to appear. *Hincmarus* of *Laon* holding on his Course, issued out an Excommunication against several Persons in the Archbishoprick of *Rheims*, and in other Archbishopricks and Diocefs, not sparing the King, *Charles* himself, which was a Cause of great Scandal to the whole Church and Kingdom. Nevertheless *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* found out a Way to compose this Matter, and to hinder the Bishops who were provoked, from bringing it before a Synod, and to reconcile his Nephew with those he had excommunicated; but this did not put an End to this Business, for *Hincmarus* of *Laon*, a Man of an untractable Temper, enraged King *Charles* again, who thereupon called an Assembly at *Verbery*, Apr. 24. 869. in which that Bishop was accused; and seeing himself ready to be condemned, he required Leave to go to *Rome*, and remove his Business thither. But King *Charles* instead of granting it, stopped him for some time, upon which he immediately excommunicated, or rather interdicted his Priests and Clergy, and forbade them to celebrate their Office, administer Baptism; yea, even to Infants in Danger of Death, to give the Communion even to dying Persons, or bury any Person in his Diocefs, till he shall return, or they receive a Letter from *Rome* to order the contrary. The Archbishop of *Rheims* having heard of this Prohibition by some of the Clergy of the Church of *Laon*, who came to complain to him, wrote immediately to his Nephew to take off the Interdict, and to the Clergy of *Laon*, that they ought to exercise their Function, and administer the Sacraments, without any regard to that dangerous and unlawful Excommunication. He sent them also some Rules taken out of the Canons to direct them how to behave themselves. The Bishop of *Laon* not regarding the Advice of his Metropolitan, he wrote to him a second time more smartly, and enjoined the Clergy of the Church of *Laon* to do their Duty. He wrote also again a third Time to the Bishop of *Laon*, who was set at liberty, after he had taken an Oath to be faithful to King *Charles*. But to justify himself, he gathered several Extracts out of the false Decretals attributed to the ancient Popes, in which it was said, that Bishops ought to be tried by the Holy See, at the first Examination; if they demanded it.

Some time after this, Pope *Adrian* wrote to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, and King *Charles*, to compel *Normannus* to restore immediately to the Church of *Laon* the Lands he was in Possession of, telling him, that if he did not do it, he would excommunicate them, and to suffer *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* to come to *Rome* to fulfil his Vow he had made of going thither, and to take Care of the Church of *Laon* in his Absence, which provoked them both against the Bishop of *Laon*.

In the mean time *Lotharius II.* King of *Lorraine*, being dead in *Italy*, Aug. 8. 869. *Charles* possessed himself of his Kingdom, and being accepted by the Grantees of the Country, he was crowned by *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, Sept. 7. in the same Year. In the beginning of the Year 870. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* expelled out of his Diocefs a Person named *Nivinus*, being accused of debauching a Nun, and carrying her away. His Nephew not only received *Nivinus*, but put him in Possession of an Estate he had in another Diocefs, and gave him in recompence of what he had lost a Pension out of the Revenues of the Church of *Laon*. *Hincmarus* wrote, Feb. 13. 870. to him, and tells him, that he ought not to receive either him or his Brother *Bertricus*, whom he had expelled out of his Diocefs for several Crimes, of which he was found guilty. *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* returned him an Answer, That he had always avoided to speak or write to him of such things as he had acted contrary to his Judgment, but he was obliged to be plain with him in reference to the Excommunication of

Of the Contests between Hincmarus and his Nephew Nivinus, and could not but tell him, that he thought that he ought not to deal with that Person as if he had been regularly accused, and could not or would not make his Defence, or had been convicted of the Crime, because when he had obtained a Time of him to clear himself, although he had no Accusers, and was come upon the Day appointed to vindicate his own Innocence by the Testimony of credible Persons, he neither found him, nor any Person in his stead to be his Judge; but without a legal Hearing he was commanded to depart out of his Diocese. He finds fault with Hincmarus for believing false Reports so easily, and assures him, that it was not true that he had received the Estate of Nivinus, or allowed him a Pension out of the Revenues of the Church. He also defends himself strongly against the Suspicion which Hincmarus had entertained against him, that he sold the Goods of the Church. He confesses that Nivinus had a great while ago offered him a part of his Estate adjoining to his, but he would not accept of his Gift, whereupon he soon after gave it to another Person; and alleges several Canons to prove, that he ought not to have passed so rash a Sentence. Lastly, he says, That he thinks Bertricus ought not to be looked upon as an excommunicated Person, because the Archbishop of Rheims could not excommunicate him who was not of his Diocese, and had neither been put to publick Penance, nor condemned by a regular Sentence.

Another Difference between the two Hincmarus's about Adulphus. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims sometime after this sent another Request to his Nephew, in which he had a more favourable Answer. The Bishop of Laon had employed a certain Priest named Adulphus in a Commission, who did not discharge his Trust well, but being reprov'd for it by his Bishop, spoke disrespectfully to him, and withdrew himself. Hincmarus angry at this, sent the Priest Clarentius to tell him, that he was excommunicated, but he stopped his Ears, and would not hear the Sentence, and then fled to Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims. Afterwards being desirous to return to Laon, the Doors of his Church and Cloyster were shut against him, to his Admiration. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims interceded for him, and desired his Nephew to receive him, and restore him to his Place, or if not, at least to receive him into Communion. Hincmarus Bishop of Laon answered him, That that Priest had fled very unjustly, and without any Necessity, telling him, that he would never have any thing to do with him. That although he had behaved himself so ill to him, yet in respect to what he had written, he would restore him to his Prebend and House, and would permit all that would to communicate with him, upon Condition that he shall not be allowed Communion with himself till he received him upon his Trial, or had Satisfaction. This Letter of Hincmarus is dated the 19th. and the Answer the 27th. of April, in the same Year 870. [This Letter with some others of Hincmarus Bishop of Laon to Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims is printed, with the Works of Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims, by Sirmondus at Paris, 1645. Vol. 2.]

Hincmarus Bishop of Laon declared openly against his Uncle. At the same time Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims and Hincmarus Bishop of Laon quarrelled about another Matter. There was a Chappel in the Diocese of Laon belonging to a Benefice of the Church of Rheims, in which there was ordinarily a Priest to officiate, who was presented by the Incumbent of the Benefice. Sigibert, who had the Benefice, had presented one named Senatus, a Servant of the Church of Rheims, and Hincmarus would set him at Liberty, that he might be ordained by the Bishop of Laon. This Clergyman, tho' he was not in Priestly Orders, had yet officiated in that Chappel for 4. Years. Then the Bishop of Laon sent thither two Priests of his Company, but after a while he removed these Priests, and would have a Priest only to bear the Titles, and that the Inhabitants should go to a Parish of the Diocese of Laon governed by Hermerardus. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims desired his Nephew, either to ordain Senatus, or to put into that Church another Priest whom he should appoint to bear the Title. Instead of satisfying his Uncle, he gave him an angry and harsh Answer, thinking himself abused by some Admonitions which he had given him in his Letter, with the Authority of his Uncle and Metropolitan. He first of all accuses him as the Author of his Imprisonment: Then he tells him, that he can't give him a full Answer as to the Business of Hermerardus, because he had not heard it canonically and regularly; That he did not remember what Decision had been made in that Business, but would inquire of those that had been present, and remembered it; That he did not positively require the Priest Adulphus to be present at the Synod to be held at Laon on the 15th. of that Month; That he wondred, that he did not send again sooner, since he had granted what he had desired; That as to Senatus, 'twas not true that he had consented that that Clerk should have the Church in debate, but on the contrary had told him, that he would deal with the Church which the Archbishop of Rheims had in his Diocese, as he had done with that which the Bishop of Laon had in his; That he had a Complaint against Sigibert for putting that Clerk into the Church that belonged to Hermerardus; That Sigibert had answered, that he did it with

the Consent of his Officers, and particularly of Adulphus; That he had answered, that if Hermerardus would relinquish that Church, well, if not, he would proceed as in Justice he might; That not being able to persuade Hermerardus to recede from his Right, he had given Notice to Sigibert by a Man that belonged to him; That afterward he took that Church from Senatus; That Hermerardus had desired to determine the Lands in a Synod; That he had advised Sigibert to accommodate the Matter; Lastly, That he could not approve of the Ordination of Senatus, and since it was faulty at first, because he was a Servant, he ought not to confirm it, nor promote him to a superior Degree of Orders.

Of the Contests between Hincmarus and his Nephew Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims being met with several other Bishops, at the Palace of King Charles in Condeville, in the Diocese of Tola, Hincmarus Bishop of Laon, instead of saluting him as he did the rest of the Bishops, would not so much as take Notice of him. Wenilo Archbishop of Rouen asking him why he would not live peaceably with his Metropolitan, he answered him, that he could never be Friends with him heartily, because he had not burnt the Writings which he had sent to him concerning the Excommunication which he had issued out against his whole Diocese; adding, that he did but follow his Example in Excommunicating, because he had excommunicated a Village in his Diocese belonging to the Bishop of Laon, because the Inhabitants had refused to pay him their Tenth, but payed them to the Church to which they belonged, so that several Infants died unbaptized, and several noble Persons without the Sacraments. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims replied to Wenilo, That that Fact was not true, and, That that Recrimination was a tacit Confession of his Fault, and in short, that he desired nothing more, but that the Writings on both Sides might be examined by a Synod. Wenilo relating this Answer to Hincmarus Bishop of Laon, he said, That he had not the Papers that had passed between them, but gave him the Papers which began with the Verses directed to Carolomanus, which was the second Collection of some Extracts of the Pope's Decretals, and Canons to settle the Judgments of the Causes of the Bishops at Rome in their first Examination. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims having read these Papers with a great deal of Earnestness, made an Answer to them, which he sent to Wenilo, to be given to the Bishop of Laon. He waited for an Answer, or expected that he would have sent him the Writings which he complained of, that they might be examined, but Hincmarus Bishop of Laon would do nothing.

When they went from hence, the King came to Attigni, The Council where he held a Synod in May, at which the Deputies of the 10. Provinces of France were present. Here they first gave the Ambassadors of Germany Audience about the Division of the Empire. Then the Business of Hincmarus Bishop of Laon was brought upon the Board. Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims after he had delivered him 55. Articles to serve for an Answer: As to the Collections he had made out of the Decretals, and to all that he had said and written against him, presented a Petition to the Council, in which he related to the Bishops all that he had done to conquer the Obstinacy of the Bishop of Laon. He was also accused in the Council by the Bishops, who complained of the unjust and rash Excommunications which he issued out against their Diocesans; by the King, That he had broken the Oath of Allegiance which he had made to him; and by the Lord Normannus, That he had put him out by Force of Arms of the Benefices which he was in lawful Possession of. Hincmarus of Laon, that he might get free from this Business, demanded that he might be judged by the Holy See, but not being able to gain that Point, he delivered a Writing, in which he promised Submission to his Metropolitan Hincmarus, and took a new Oath of Allegiance to King Charles, but he desired that Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims should give him a Writing to oblige himself to maintain him in the Privileges that belonged to him, and to defend him. Froarius Archbishop of Bourdeaux was the Mediator of this Peace. But since the Accusations of Normannus and his Wife, who complained of their ill Usage, and that they were unjustly deprived of the Benefices they had enjoyed, and also of some others to the same Effect, did yet stand unsatisfied, Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims chose for the Judges of that Affair Actardus Bishop of Nants, Ragenelmus Bishop of Noyon, and John Bishop of Cambray. These Judges examined that Matter before the King, and were of Opinion, that the Bishop of Laon ought to restore some of those Benefices, but they did not give their Judgment upon the Day prefixed, but put it off to another Day to give Sentence. Then Hincmarus Bishop of Laon, seeing that the Affair would not go well for him, escaped away in the Night. What passed afterwards, I shall give you an Account of, when I have given an Abridgment of the 55. Articles which Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims presented in the Council to his Nephew, as an Answer to all that he had written and said against him.

In the Beginning of this Work he puts some Verses, as Hincmarus an Answer to those which Hincmarus Bishop of Laon had put Articles.

put before his second Collection of Canons, and as this Bishop had taken this for the Subject of his Verses, *That Men might freely appeal to the Holy See*, so he made it the Subject of his, that according to the Canons all the Bishops of a Province ought to be subject to their Metropolitans, and sharply reproves his Nephew for not giving him the Respect due to him.

In Art. 1. he explains the Business about the Chappel, where the Bishop of *Laon* accused him for excommunicating the Inhabitants because they would not pay the Tenth. He says, That the Chappel, which was in the Country of *Attolia*, had been a long time before subject to the Priest of the Church of the Village of *Juvigny*; That *Bertierus*, sent by the Bishop of *Laon* to take Care of that Place, had hindered them from paying their Tithes to the Priest of the Parish, and had employed them as he pleased; That the Priest *Aufoldus*, who was to take Care of the Diocess of *Rheims*, where this Chappel stood, had demanded Justice several times against *Bertierus*, and when he could not obtain it, he forbid celebrating Divine Service in that Chappel till the Inhabitants should pay their Tithes to their Curate according to the ancient Usage, in which if they would hearken to him, they might come to the Church of *Juvigny*, but that Baptism and the Communion were denied to no Man, neither did any Man die in that Time without receiving the Sacraments. Having thus cleared himself as to that Matter, he proves by a long Possession, that the Chappel of the Court and Lordship of *Attolia* did belong to the Territories within the Diocess of *Rheims*.

In Art. 2. he reproves the Bishop of *Laon* for getting an Abby, and taking an Office at Court without his Leave, and proves, that by the Canons such Things are not allowable to Suffragan Bishops without the Consent of their Metropolitan; as also for excommunicating *Amalbertus* of the Diocess of *Rheims*, being accused of Impotency by his Wife, who was taken out of the Bishoprick of *Laon*.

In Art. 3. he reproves him for excommunicating Persons not of his own Diocess.

In Art. 4. he relates what had passed about the Writings in the Conferences with *Wenilo*.

In Art. 5. he answers the threatening Speeches which the Bishop of *Laon* had given out, that he could withstand his Metropolitan, and valued him not, because the Holy See had already disannulled two Sentences passed by him, viz. those against *Rothadus* and *Wulfadus*. As to the former, after he hath produced several Canons to prove, that Metropolitans and a Synod of the Province had a Right to judge the Bishops at the first Tryal, although the Holy See might afterwards restore them if it thought fit; He says, That the Pope did not find Fault with the Judgment in *France* given against *Rothadus*, but through his great Wisdom, he had desired them to restore that Bishop who had implored his Help. That as to the second Judgment he was not concerned for it, being none of the Judges, and that since the Holy See would not join with so rigorous a Sentence, he had consented to his Pleasure and the Will of the King. That he had fully cleared himself to Pope *Nicholas*, and that his Successor *Adrian* had through his Goodness put away all Displeasure and Anger about that Matter. In fine, he says, That he had always done with Alacrity what the Holy See had desired of him, to avoid all Differences, being persuaded, as St. *Leo* says, that the Pope hath some Reason to mitigate the Severity of the Laws, on Condition that they should ever after beware of it, and keep to the due Execution of the Canons.

In Art. 6. he enquires into the Truth of what *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* had said to several Persons concerning his Uncle, *That he had loosed those whom he had bound, had deposed those whom he had ordained, I will cause that he or I will never sing Mass more*; *Hincmarus* shews, That it did not become him who was his Inferior to speak so of him, and vindicates the Rights of Metropolitans, and the Difference between them and other Bishops. It belongs to them to call Synods, and all their Suffragans are bound to come to them, or send their Excuse, and if they do not so, they may punish them; That the Accusations against any Bishop ought to be brought to them, and they may appoint Judges for the Accused, or consent to them that are elected. It belongs to them to ordain the Bishops of their Provinces, and those that are not ordained with their Consent, ought not to be acknowledged for Bishops according to the Council of *Nice*, whereas, if a Bishop be ordained with the Consent of his Metropolitan, and other Bishops of the Province, except one or two, his Ordination is accounted good. If a Bishop dies in his Province, it belongs to the Metropolitan to name a Visitor of the vacant Church. A Bishop ought to sign the Regulations and Canons which his Metropolitan presents to him, if they contain nothing in them contrary to the Faith. He can't make any Changes or Alterations in the Lands of his Diocess, without the Consent and Advice of his Metropolitan. Men may appeal from the Judgments of the Bishop to the Metropolitan; if he hath excommunicated any Person, and will not receive him again, he may be absolved by his Metropolitan in a Synod of Bishops. Lastly,

VOL. II.

The Metropolitan hath a Care of all the Province, and all those that have any Ecclesiastical Matters may apply themselves to him, and he can take Cognizance of them: A Bishop hath only the Government of his own Diocess, in which he may ordain Priests and Deacons; if he hath any Differences with another Bishop, they can't take the Bishops of another Province for Judges; he can do nothing in the general Affairs of a Province without his Metropolitan: In dubious Causes he ought to assist him, he ought not to go directly to *Rome*; if he will go out of his Province, he must first obtain Leave of his Metropolitan. Nevertheless, if he hath any Accusation against his Metropolitan, he may demand Judges of the Holy See, according to the Council of *Sardica*. Lastly, The Metropolitan may cause the Canons, and Constitutions of the Church, to be put in Execution in all the Province, without assembling any Synod, or consulting the Bishops, and if he finds any thing opposite to them, he may reform it immediately, because in so doing he is the Author of no new Laws, but the Executer of the old only.

In the 7th. Article, he reproves *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Laon*, for going out of his Diocess without his Consent, and flying from the Judgment of his Metropolitan and the Bishops of his Province.

In the 8th. Article, he accuses him for sending the Pope's Letters directed to the King and himself, by such Archbishops as were at a Distance from him, whereas he ought to have sent them by his own Messengers.

In the 9th. Article, he reproves him for having excommunicated a Monk of St. *Dennis*, which the King had put in a Monastery in the Diocess of *Laon*, and would not be persuaded to revoke that Excommunication.

In the 10th. Article, he answers the Collection of Decretals made by *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, and because he grounded the Authority of these Records upon a Passage of St. *Leo*, who says, that we are obliged to obey the Decrees of his Predecessors, made and promulgated concerning the Orders and Discipline of the Church, *quæ de Ecclesiasticis Ordinibus, et Canonum sunt promulgata disciplinis*: He explains the Signification of this Expression, and affirms, that it ought to be understood of the Laws taken out of the Canons, and which they have published in their Decretals, and not of the private Decrees which they have made, and which are not agreeable to them; whereupon he cites several Sentences of the Popes, which declare, That we ought to observe the Canons.

In the following Articles, as far as the 16th. he treats of the Order and Subordination in general, which ought to be among the Bishops.

In the 16th. Article he treats in particular concerning the Subordination of the Church of *Laon* to that of *Rheims*: He says that this Metropolis had eleven Churches under it, before St. *Remigius* erected the Castle of *Laon* in that Bishoprick: That the Bishoprick of *Laon* owes its Erection to the Church of *Rheims*, and that it hath always been subject to it: That the Authority of St. *Remigius* is in his Successors, and that this Metropolis hath been dignified with several Privileges by the Holy See.

In the 17th. he cites several Passages in the Pope's Letters against those Inferiors that exalt themselves against their Superiors.

In the 18th. and 19th. he shews that several have destroyed themselves through Pride and Vanity, by explaining Holy Scripture according to their own Fancies, and by governing according to their own Humour, without following the Tradition of the Church.

In the 20th. he shews that the Discipline of the Church may change and alter: He speaks of the first six General Councils, whose Authority he acknowledged. As to the seventh he says, That 'twas not received in *France*, and cites a Passage of the *Caroline* Book concerning the General Nature of Synods. Afterwards, he heaps together many Historical Facts, in which he is mistaken in giving credit to the Supposititious Letters of *Mark* and *Felix*.

In the 22d. he explains St. *Gregory's* Words in his Letter to *Theodistus*, that they ought not to be absolved who are excommunicated by the Church; and maintains, that they ought to be understood of these only that are excommunicated for just Reasons, because we ought not to think that unjust Excommunications are made by the Church.

In the 23d. and 24th. Articles, he says, That the *Roman* Church hath not received the 9th. Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, in that which respects the Permission, which it gives to a Clerk, who hath any thing against his Metropolitan, to apply himself to the Bishop of *Constantinople*. In the last of these Articles, he rejects the Collection of Canons, which was said to be given by Pope *Adrian* to *Angilram*.

In the 25th. and 26th. He shews that there is a Difference to be observed between the Decisions of General Councils and the Letters of Holy Men and Popes: That 'tis absolutely necessary to obey all the Decisions of the Councils, but the same Subjection is not due to all that is contain'd in those Letters.

Of the
Contests
between
Hincma-
rus and
his Nephew

In the 27th. he shews, that *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* is not exempted from answering, for saying, That he was stopped; and by pretending that he hath appealed to *Rome*.

In the 28th. he says, That 'twas an Injury to interdict his Priests and Clerks without any Accusation, or they were either convicted of their Crimes, or confessed them. To prove this, he produces a great Number of Canons, which prescribe the Order to be observed in Ecclesiastical Judgments, and what ought to go before the Condemnation of every Person.

In the 29th. and 30th. he shews, That Superiors have a Right to declare no Excommunications which are manifestly irregular and contrary to the Laws of the Church, such as that was by which the Bishop of *Laon* forbade to administer Baptism to Infants, and the Sacrament to dying Persons, contrary to the Decrees of the Church, which do not allow the Sacraments to be denied to any Persons in their Necessity. He sets down in this Article many good Rules about Excommunication.

In the following Article he says, 'Tis great Inhumanity to deny Burial to the Dead.

In the 34th. he shews, by several Passages out of the Pope's Letters, that about Matters evident, or already decided, 'tis not necessary to call a Synod, nor appeal to the Holy See, and that the things already ordained and decreed should be put in Execution.

In the 35th. Article he proves, That the Holy See judges with the Bishops, and the Bishops with the Holy See; That no Man can put a restraint upon Metropolitans, nor hinder them from judging the Affairs of their Province, much less in that which is already ordained, and decided by the Councils. He adds, that in these things there is no need of consulting, or calling together the Bishops of the Province.

In the 36th. Article, he examines the Subscription of the Instrument of the Bishop of *Laon*, by which he excommunicated those that would not obey the Decrees of the Popes contained in his Collection. He says, That if he affirms that this Collection contains any thing singular in it, and contrary to the Constitutions of the Council of *Nice*, and the other Councils received and approved of by the Church, he is himself excommunicated by endeavouring to excommunicate others, and so hath separated himself from the Church's Unity with those he hath caused to sign it.

In the following Articles to the 43^d. he gives him wholesome Advice, and assures him in the 40th. that he was no Cause that he was out of Favour with the King.

In the 43^d. he vindicates himself from the Calumny that the Bishop of *Laon* had cast upon him, in accusing him of falsifying the Quotations which he cited. He speaks of the Business of *Nivinus*, he says, that his Crime was publick and certain, that all the World knew that he had debauched the Nun, and had conveyed her by Night out of the Monastery into his House; that the thing being discovered, the Nun had undergone her Penance in the Convent, and afterward he had conveyed her away; that he had done all he could to make him acknowledge his Fault, and oblige him to do Penance, but instead of undergoing Penance, he had affronted and abused him; whereupon he excommunicated him, and expelled him out of his Diocese.

In the 44th. and 45th. Articles, he exhorts his Nephew to come to an Agreement, lay aside all Animosities and Enmities, and to take mild Methods to gain the King's Favour without going to *Rome*.

In the 46th. and 47th. he reproves him for bragging he was never conquered.

In the 48th. he says, 'Tis very dangerous for a Man to be too fond of his own Opinion.

In the 49th. he advises him not to abuse the Talent that God hath given him.

In the 50th. he reproves him for not suffering any to say, That he hath received any Kindness, or good Turn, which he hath not deserved.

In the 51st. he accuses him of receiving Presents from his Clergy, and proves, that it is forbidden by the Canons.

In the 52^d. he accuses him of being arrogant, proud and vain.

In the 53^d. he gives him Advice about his Gesture, and the Motions of his Body, which were indecent.

In the 54th. he exhorts him not to misuse his Health of Body, or Pleasures of the World, in the Flower of his Age. Lastly, he concludes this Work with *Elias's* Words to *Elisha*, *I have done for you all I was able*. He adds, that he believes, tho' he shall not profit by his Advice, that it will not be in vain, before God, to him that gives it. He prays to God to grant to him, to will, say, know, and do what he hath commanded, and to make his Nephew to hear favourably, and do what is convenient for him, and that both of them may will and do what he hath commanded, and persevere in the Observance of his Commandments.

The Sequel
of the Af-
fair of
Hincma-
rus of

We will now return to the remaining Part of the Business of *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*: After he was gone from *Attigni*, as we said before, he wrote a Letter to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, which was given him the 12th. of

July by one of his Deacons named *Ermenoldus*, in which he beseeches him, that since he had appealed twice to the Pope, as they themselves acknowledged, he would get Leave of the King to let him go thither. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* returned him no Answer, whereupon he wrote directly to the King, and having excused himself for not coming to him, because he had a Fever, he prays him earnestly to let him go to *Rome*, that having performed his Vow, he may be recovered from his Fever. The King answered *Bertricus*, who brought him the Letter, That 'twas a wonder that the Fever, which kept him from Court, should not hinder him from going to *Rome*; that he should come to him, and if he had any just Cause of going to *Rome*, he would permit him. The King also commanded him to give a Benefice to one named *Eloi*. *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* having received this Answer, sent *Heddo*, Provost of the Church of *Laon*, to carry a Petition to the Archbishop of *Rheims*, in which he tells him, 1. That he greeted him, and prayed for him. 2. That he was persuaded that he was sensible that he was persecuted, and that he did share in his Sufferings. 3. That the King had taken away the Revenues of the Church of *Laon*, and given them to *Normannus*, which he knew when he withdrew from *Attigni*. 4. That some other Persons had possessed themselves of the Lands belonging to the Church by the King's Order, who had required him to restore a Benefice to *Eloi*, who had forcibly gotten it. 5. That he intreated him, who was his Uncle and Archbishop, to obtain of the King that he might have a free Administration of the Revenues of his Church, and to order and dispose of them, as he thought fit: He promises in this Juncture to obey him, come to him, and follow his Directions, protesting, That if the King will not grant him this Favour, he never will obey him more, nor never come in his Presence: That he will fly to the Holy See, and use his Authority by excommunicating those who have invaded the Goods of the Church, as it is allowed in the Constitution of the Bishops, which he had sent him. This Constitution was made up of certain Canons of the Council held in 860. at *Toussi*, in the Diocese of *Tola*, which decreed, among other things, that those who violently seized upon the Goods of the Church, should be excommunicated for their whole Lives, nor should obtain Communion at their Death, nor have a Christian Burial; That the Princes and Judges should find out such Persons as corrupted Virgins and Widows dedicated to God, upon Penalty of being expelled out of the Church, and deprived of Burial; That those that have taken away any of the Church Revenues, or Goods, should restore them double, treble, or fourfold, according to the Thing they have taken.

Altho' the Name of *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* be among the Subscriptions to the Canons of this Council, yet when he received this Writing, he said he had never heard of any such Constitutions, and that the Bishops who were present at that Council said the same thing: He says, That these Constitutions are unreasonable, and contrary to the Laws of the Church, and judged by the Subscriptions, that those Acts were false, because he found the Names of some Bishops that were not there, and two Bishops of the same See at the same time, viz. Two Bishops of *Auxerre*, *Christianus*, and *Ablo*, and two Bishops of *Noin*, *Immo* and *Raginelmus*, who succeeded him. He adds, that his Seal was among others there, altho' he was sure that he had not set his Seal to that Act.

This Petition of *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* was given to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* at *Pontigon*, July 16. by *Heddo*: He represented his Nephew's Petition to the King, and got the Bishops then at Court to second him in it, viz. *Remigius*, *Harduicus*, *Odo*, and *Willibert*. The King answered, That he thought the Bishop of *Laon* might be satisfied with what was said at *Attigni*; That he had taken more than belonged to his Church out of the Estate which the Prince was willing to give him, so that he might re-enter upon the Lands of *Pauls*; but as to the other Revenues about which the Contest was, he must wait till the Matter could be regulated, and Commissioners be sent on both sides to the Places to examine what doth really belong to the Church, that it may be restored to it. As to the Benefices of which he speaks, *Hincmarus* answers him, That he had deprived the lawful Heirs of them, to whom he himself had once granted them; and that the Judges, which he had chosen, had determined that he ought to restore them; that he would stay but till some Articles were decided before he fled, and would not wait till Sentence were pronounced; That he might return, and bring with him the Arrest, by which the King had given, or restored to the Church of *Laon*, the Lands in question, and would do him Justice. In fine, that he had sent him a Writing of that which was done in the Council of *Toussi*, which he never saw, and of which the Bishops of that Council never heard, and which was not agreeable to the Original he had. Lastly, he advises him not to excommunicate *Normannus*, nor any others, rashly, nor go to *Rome* till 'twas examin'd in a Provincial Synod, whether his Appeal to the Holy See were regular.

Hincmarus Bishop of *Laon* returned a long Answer to this Letter of *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, in which he tells

Of the
Contests
between
Hincma-
rus and
his Nephew

A Peti-
tion of
Hincma-
rus Bishop
of *Laon*.

The An-
swer to the
Bishop of
Laon's
Petition.

The Bish-
op of *Laon*
Answer

Of the
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus and
his Nephew

tells him, That he did not desire to enjoy the Revenues of the Church to put them to a bad use, but to employ them as the Canons prescribe; and that it could not but trouble him much to see the Revenues, which were intended for the Subsistence of himself and Clergy, to be taken away, and given to a Person to whom his Predecessor would never grant a Church-Farm; That another had got a Farm granted him, which used to furnish the Church with Candles; and several others were given to such Persons, who had done no Service to the Church a long time, and could be no ways profitable to it; That the King never spake a word to him, of that which *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* mentioned to him; and that he only told him, that he heard he had taken more Grounds in the Lands of *Paulls* than belonged to him, or were granted by the Letters he had sent him; That he would have them; That he was willing that he should enjoy what was contained in these Letters, except the Farms in the possession of *Ansgarius*, who was his Man, upon condition, nevertheless, that they should restore them to him, if he found that they belonged to the Lands of *Paulls*; That the King had delayed to restore them to him, but he was put upon doing it by the Advice of *Hincmarus*; That he had not unjustly seized upon, and kept those Farms, but they have belonged above 60 Years to the Lands of *Paulls*; That he had enjoyed them ever since the King had restored those Lands, six months since, till *Ansgarius* had obtain'd them of the King, without any cognizance of the Cause, and without examining his Claim. As to the Judges, which, he says, were named by him, it is true that the King ordered the Archbishop of *Rheims* to nominate some Bishops who should examine the Affair of those who complained that they were deprived of their Benefices; that *Hincmarus* having named them, he did appear before them with one Clergyman and Layman of his Church; that *Regenard* having preferred his complaint first, he did shew his Reasons why he deprived him; and whereas, among other things, he had accused him of not paying the Service due, the Judges required him to take an Oath that it was so, and that *Regenard* should lose his Benefice. Whereupon *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* complains, that the Judges regarded Temporal more than Spiritual Causes, because being also accused of spoiling the Farms, and having abused the Revenues of the Church, they did not condemn him to make any Restitution. The second that made his complaint was one *Griwon*, who being accused of spoiling a Wood which his Father had planted, he defended himself by saying, 'Twas not so, and that 'twas some Peasant that had wasted it against his knowledge; and that *Hincmarus* had deprived him of his Benefice only because he would not go to *Rome*; That when *Hincmarus* maintained the contrary, and produced his Witnesses, they put off the Judgment of that Affair till next Week. He then confesses, that he withdrew himself, but says 'twas to avoid the Persecution intended against him; That all his Family was banished; That they favoured the Lord *Normannus*, who was excommunicated both by the Pope and himself; That they would not permit him to go to *Rome*, but had taken away the Revenues that belong to his Church. As to the Constitution of the Synod of *Toussi*, he says, that he received it of *Harduicus* Archbishop of *Besancon*, who was present at it; and that it was written by two of his Deacons; and that he remembers well, that 'twas made in that Council; That 'tis true, that he had composed another Letter, but finding it too long, he thought it best to sign this which was shorter, and, as it were, an abridgment of the other. Lastly, he enlarges upon the Pope's Decretals; he affirms that they do not contradict one another, and that the Bishops, who desire to be judged at *Rome*, at the first examination ought to be sent thither. He complains of his Archbishop, that he had been no Help to him since he desired to be sent thither, but, on the contrary, opposed his Interest. This is the Answer that *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* gave his Metropolitan; but having no mind to have to do with him, nor those Ecclesiastical Judges that he had nominated, he resolved to request Secular Judges of the King, two months after he retired from *Attigni*. The King appointed *Helmingarius*, *Hotarius* and *Urfio* who were Court-Officers. These Judges altered, and re-examined the things that had been decided by the Ecclesiastical Judges, and were more favourable to *Hincmarus* of *Laon* than they had been, for they made the Lord *Normannus* to leave his Benefice; and others, who had gotten possession of the Benefices in contest through the flight of *Hincmarus*, to resign them to him again. Things being thus ordered, *Hincmarus* of *Laon* returned to Court, and never spake more of going to *Rome*.

A new
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus of La-
on and the
King.

Hincmarus, Archbishop of *Rheims*, was very angry that his Nephew had so well acquitted himself before the Lay-Judges, condemning the Authority of his See, and the Judges he had appointed; wherefore he wrote to him with a great deal of Passion. Nevertheless, the Judgment given for him was executed; but not long after, *Hincmarus* of *Laon* engaged in a fresh Quarrel with King *Charles* upon the account of *Caroloman*. This happened thus: *Caroloman*, the Eldest Son of King *Charles*, was baptized in the Church of *Rheims*, and devoted by his Father to be a Churchman, having been

shaved, and afterwards received all the Orders, as far as a Deacon, from the Hands of *Hildegarius* Bishop of *Meaux*; but because he was forced to embrace a Profession, which displeased him, he resolved to make his escape, and being got away, he conspired against his Father. He was accused in the Synod of *Attigni*, and condemned as a Rebel, and thereupon being deprived of his Abbies was put in Prison. Having appealed to *Rome*, the Pope wrote in his favour, and a little after he was set at Liberty. But in the Year following he began his Quarrel again, took Arms, gathered Troops, and plundered the Country. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, in the absence of the King, who was gone into *Burgundy*, assembled the Bishops of his Province immediately, and after he had admonished him four times that he should lay down his Arms, he declared him excommunicated, and all his Soldiers, which were the greatest part of the Province of *Rheims*, if they did not reform, and do Penance before the 11th. of *March*. *Hincmarus* sent this Letter of Excommunication to *Remigius* Archbishop of *Lyons*, and to the Bishops of his Province, and wrote on purpose to *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, to require his consent, under Hand, to this Excommunication, but he gave him no Answer to it; wherefore he wrote a second time more earnestly to him. Then he answered, that he would not give his consent to it, because he had not answered his desire made to him by *Heddo*, which he ought to have added in that Act. *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* replied, that *Heddo* had never spoke to him about it, and that he had not any thing to add. Nevertheless, he desired him to tell him plainly what he would have added, promising that he would do it if it were reasonable, being always ready to learn of others, follow their advice, and reform any thing that was amiss. In the rest of the Letter, he speaks with loftiness to his Nephew, and shews that he is greatly displeased with his Disobedience. 'Tis dated Aug. 19.

On the 5th. of *May*, a Clergyman of *Laon* called *Tentlandus* coming to *Rheims*, the Archbishop ordered him to bid his Bishop to send his consent immediately to the Excommunication of *Caroloman*. Lastly, *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* being admonished a 6th. time by a Letter from his Metropolitan, answered, that he wondred he should desire his consent to that Excommunication, since he had not taken his Advice in issuing it out. He also complains, that his Uncle had sent his Summons by the Clergymen of his own Church, and that he had pronounced a Benediction in the Dioceses of *Laon* upon some of the Confederates of *Caroloman*.

On the 14th. of *May*, *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* cited the Bishop of *Laon* to a Synod, which was to be held, that he should answer to the complaints and accusations brought against him; but he, instead of giving a civil answer, wrote a Letter full of Invectives and Affronts, in which he accuses him of betraying, and delivering him up, when he was apprehended, and of being his Enemy ever since he opposed him in his putting a Bishop into *Rothadus*'s place, till he should receive the Pope's pleasure about that Affair. Nevertheless, *Adrian* wrote two Letters in favour of *Caroloman* to the King his Father, to the Bishops of *France*, and the Lords, in which he forbids the last taking Arms against *Caroloman*, and the others to excommunicate him. These Letters bear date July 13th. but they did *Caroloman* no service, as we shall shew anon. This Pope wrote also to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, March 25. to call a Synod for the Reformation of Abuses in his Dioceses; and under this pretence *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims* cited *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, in the Name of the Pope, and by his Authority, to the Synod which was to be holden at *Douzi*, Aug. 5. The Act says July 5.

The Council being assembled at *Douzi*, King *Charles* presented a Bill to them containing several heads of Accusation against *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*; the beginning of it is lost. In that part which remains, he accuses him for writing to *Rome* against him, at the same time when he acknowledged in *France*, that he had not meddled with any of the Revenues of the Church; for going out of his Kingdom into *Lotharius*'s; for not coming to him when he had commanded him, and for hindering his Servants to come to him; for writing a second time to *Rome* against him; for flying from *Attigni* after he had sworn Allegiance to him; Lastly, for arming his Servants to hinder the Governor of the Province, that he might not apprehend certain suspicious Persons which were at his House, to send them to the Council, but let them escape. When this Bill was read, the King desired, that since the Bishop of *Laon*, who had been cited by his Metropolitan to appear before the Council, did not come, they would search what the Canons and Laws decreed concerning those heads of Accusation brought against him; and if he came to the Synod, that the differences between him and his Metropolitan should be judged and determined.

Hincmarus Archbishop of *Rheims* presented another Petition to the Synod, in which he briefly relates all that had passed between him and *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, the causes of complaint he had against him, the heads of Accu-

Of the
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus and
his Nephew

sation that he charged him with, and the consequence of the whole matter, setting down under every Article the Decisions of the Popes and Councils, shewing wherein the Bishop of *Laon* had offended, and the punishment he deserved. He defends himself, against the Accusation, that he had betrayed him, and produces three Letters written at the time he was seized, to shew that he had no hand in his Imprisonment, but had disapproved it. He also justifies himself against the Accusation, that he had no respect to the Judgment of the Holy See, and slighted its Authority, and treats of what passed at *Atigni* about that matter. Lastly, he concludes, that *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon* having been summoned three times by the Council and not appearing, ought to be condemned for his Contumacy, notwithstanding the Appeal he had made to the Holy See, because it is irregular, and he hath not prosecuted it.

The Bishops of the Council desiring some time to answer the King's Request, made a Collection of the Canons, Laws, and Testimonies of the Fathers, upon every head of the Accusation contain'd in that Bill, concerning the false Oaths and Perjury, the Sedition and Violence he had used, concerning the alienating of the Revenues of his Church, the Calumnies he had written to *Rome* against his Prince, his Disobedience and Rebellion, and for having made many of the King's Subjects to fly.

This Memoir was read in the Council, and *Hincmarus*, Bishop of *Laon*, summoned again to the Council. But he answered, that he had appealed to the Holy See. The Bishop of *Soissons*, who cited him, told him, that he ought to appear at the Synod, and if it were necessary for him then to appeal, they would suffer him to prosecute it. *Hermerardus* also was cited by the Synod. These Citations having been repeated three times, at last *Hincmarus* appeared before the Council; but *Hermerardus* would not come. They then read to him the King's Bill, and a Letter from the Pope sent to him, in which he was ordered to be obedient to his Metropolitan, with an allowance of an Appeal to the Holy See, if there were just Cause.

The next day, he was summoned to the Council, to answer to the Accusations brought against him by the King. On the 14th of *August* he came; and *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, having ordered him to answer to the King's Petition, he said, that he was deprived of all his Revenues, and would not answer in that Synod: And taking up his Papers, he began to read the Canons concerning Bishops Appeals. The Council ordered him to answer the Accusations brought against him, giving him Liberty afterwards to appeal to the Holy See, if he would. He persisted in his first Answer, that he was deprived of his Revenues, and would not answer. They asked him, who had deprived him? He answered, his Clergymen knew: And one of them being asked about it, answered, that it was the King; who immediately said 'twas false, and accused *Hincmarus* of arming his Servants to hinder that his Governor might send several Persons accused of Treachery to the Council, of saving them, of flying himself, and carrying with him the Sacred Vessels and Ornaments of the Church of our Lady at *Laon*, which made him so backward to make his Defence: That since he came to the Synod, he had prepared him an House where his Servants might lodge, but he chose rather to abide in his Court near the Church: That he had ordered *Bernard* to treat him civilly, and take care of his Goods and Papers: That they had brought them to him, with a Golden Cross set with Stones, and several things belonging to the Church. The King proved the Facts by Witnesses, though the very Clergy of the Bishop of *Laon* owned them. He was accused of having taken away and given a Chalice, with a Patten of Gold set with Stones, to a Priest, to hide for him, which the King had given to the Church of *St. Mary* at *Laon*; of having taken away the Relicks and Deeds of the Church of *Laon*, with a Golden Cross; so not only enriching himself with the Goods of the Church of *Laon*, but suffering his Servants to convey them away.

Hincmarus, Archbishop of *Rheims*, having summoned him to answer these Accusations, he said, he would not answer before him, because he had something against him, and therefore appealed to the Holy See. *Hincmarus* answered him, that he ought not to decline his Judgment, since he had often reproved him, and admonished him, but had not yet judged him, and so he could not appeal to *Rome*; because by the ancient Canons, no Appeals can be made thither, but after Judgment: Wherefore he ought to answer, and should be tried without any Prejudice to the Privileges or Judgment of the Pope, as it is decreed by the Council of *Sardica*, that he might appeal to *Rome* after the Judgment of the Provincial Synod. *Hincmarus*, Bishop of *Laon*, said, that he would not answer, nor accept his Metropolitan for his Judge, because he had advised the King to take him Prisoner. *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, having prayed the King to speak the Truth, the King protested with an Oath, that he did it without the Consent of the Archbishop of *Rheims*, and added, that had it not been for the Respect he had for him, he would have imprisoned him above two years

ago for his Insolencies; and that if he had not kept his Lords from it, he had been set upon in his Palace, and stabbed or beaten to death. *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, also prayed *Ado* and *Hildebaldus*, who were present when the Bishop of *Laon* was apprehended, to speak what they knew; who both of them testified, as well as two Priests and Earls, that it was done without the Privy of the Archbishop of *Rheims*.

After this, *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, read over again the King's Request, and interrogated him about every Article; but he would not answer: But all the heads were proved against *Hincmarus*, Bishop of *Laon*, either by Writing or Witnesses; and being required three times to answer, the Archbishops of *Besancon*, *Bourdeaux*, *Bourges*, *Trives*, *Rouen*, *Sens*, and the Bishops of *Troyes*, *Tongres*, *Meaux*, *Mets*, *Chartres*, *Beauvais*, *Tournay*, *Poitiers*, *Cambray*, *Orleans*, *Chalons*, *Soissons*, *Verdun*, and *Paris*, with the Rural Bishop of *Tongres*, were of Opinion, that he ought to be deposed, without Prejudice to the Judgment of the Holy See, *salvo per omnia Apostolica Sedis Judicio*. *Hincmarus*, who gave his Opinion last, was of the same Judgment. This Sentence was sealed by these Prelates and some Priests. The Name of the Bishop of *Lyons*, *Remigius*, is found among the Subscriptions; but he was not at this Synod. The Bishops of the Council wrote a Letter to Pope *Adrian*, in which they tell him, That they were forced to depose *Hincmarus*, Bishop of *Laon*, as he will understand by the Acts of the Council, which they sent him. Beside the Crimes therein set down, they accuse him of having converted to his own use, or given away, several of the Ornaments of the Church of *Laon*, to have stirred up many Seditions, to have excommunicated and abused *Amalbertus*. They desire the Pope to confirm their Judgment, or if he thought fit to review it, (which they could not think necessary) That he would appoint Judges, either of the same or neighbouring Provinces, and if he pleased, send his Legate to be present at the Judgment, as it is appointed in the Council of *Sardica*; upon condition nevertheless, That *Hincmarus* shall not be restored to his Dignity, till his Cause be examined and tried anew in the Province; because as yet they had not departed from the Rights of the *Gallican* and *Belgick* Churches. They declare, That if he restores him, and sends him into *France*, they'll never trouble themselves with him, but let him live as he list without communicating with him. They recommend, in the last place, to him *Athardus*, who was desired by the People and Clergy of *Tours*, that he might be made Bishop of that Church by his Authority, altho' they could do it themselves. This Letter is dated *Sept. 6. 871*.

Hincmarus wrote also in his own Name to Pope *Adrian*; *Hincmarus* begins his Letter with the business of *Athardus*, and afterwards speaks of the Condemnation of the Bishop of *Laon*. He excuses himself, that he did not maintain him in the business with *Normannus*, because he was injured, and the case was not that which he had related to the Pope. He laments that he ever ordain'd him, and says, That after he had done all he could to reclaim him, and found him incorrigible, he was forced to leave him, and suffer him to be condemned. Lastly, He gives the Pope an account of the business of the Priest, who was deposed for endeavouring to kill, and actually wounding with a Spear, another with whom he was travelling in a Journey, after he had made himself Drunk with him.

Pope *Adrian*, having received the Letter of the Bishops of the Council, returned an Answer, That he approved their Election of *Athardus* for the Bishoprick of *Tours*, but he disapproved the Judgment given against *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, contrary to his Appeal to be judged at *Rome*; He orders that he should come with his Accusers thither, and forbids them them putting any other Bishop in his place, till his Cause be examined and tried anew. This Letter bears Date *Dec. 26*.

He also wrote at the same time two Letters to *Charles the Bald*. In the first, which he intended to be publick, he complains, that he had taken his Petitions, which he made to him, ill, and exhorted him to accept them favourably. He orders him to send *Hincmarus*, and his Accusers, to *Rome*, assuring him, that he would not consent to his Deposition till that were done. He approves the Promotion of *Athardus* to the Archbishoprick of *Tours*, without depriving him, nevertheless, of the Right which he hath to the Reversion of the Diocess of *Nants*. He exhorts the King to see, that all the Revenues of the Church of *Tours* be restored that belong to it, as also the Monasteries, which according to the Canons are subject to that Bishop.

The second Letter, which was private and secret, was wrote with more mildness and assurance, but he insists more particularly upon this, That the King had not received his Admonitions with all possible subjection, and that he had enriched himself with the Revenues of the Church. In the rest, he pretends a great deal of Friendship to him, commends his Piety, blames the carriage of *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, and seems to think him faulty, and justly condemned; but nevertheless, hopes he will send him to *Rome*,

Of the
Contest
between
Hincma-
rus and
his Nephew

Adrian's
Answer.

Of the Contest between Hincmarus and his Nephew King Charles's Answer to the Pope.

Rome, that after he hath heard him, he may appoint him Judges, or send his Legates to the place to have him judged before them there.

King Charles being offended at these two Letters of the Pope, as also at a former, which the Pope had written to him, full of reproachful Language to his Person, which he exhorted him to bear patiently, and take in good part, writ sharply to him, and shewed himself angry for being treated in such a manner; and because he had ordered him to send Hincmarus immediately to Rome. Hereupon he accuses him of Worldly Pride, in ambitiously claiming a Dominion in the Church; and says, That he did not know before, that a King, whose Office is to punish Evil doers, and revenge Crimes, was obliged to send the guilty to Rome, after they were condemned and convicted; That he should know; that the Kings of France are not the Bishops Vicegerents, but absolute Masters of their Country; That he doth not find that the Popes, his Predecessors, did ever write in that fashion to the Kings of France. Then he recites several expressions of the Popes, and shews by many Ecclesiastical Laws, that no Canon obliged him to send Condemned Bishops to Rome, but on the contrary, that Ecclesiastical Causes should be judged and determined in the Province where the Matters were acted. Lastly, He advises him not to write to him more in such a strain, nor to the Bishops and Lords of his Kingdom, unless he will have his Letters and Messengers slighted, which he wrote to him, saith he, because of the respect he did bear to him, and because of the design he had to be subject, as he ought, to the Vicar of St Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, lest he should force him, against his Will, to do otherwise than he intended. In fine, that he knew that he ought to follow, and to hold to that which was approved by the Holy See, when 'tis found agreeable to the Holy Scripture, Tradition, and the Laws of the Church, but rejected the Claim which was grounded upon forged, and ill-composed Pieces.

The Execution of the Judgment given against Hincmarus.

Nor did the Bishops of France write with less Resolution to the Pope about that Affair, they boldly rejected the pretences the Pope had, that Hincmarus should come to Rome and be judged; and maintain'd, that the Judgment given against that Bishop ought to be executed: And in effect it was done, and the Church of Laon became vacant *de facto & de jure*, altho' the Holy See would not confirm the Judgment of the Synod of Douzi. Hincmarus Bishop of Laon was put in Prison, and two years after his Eyes were put out, as Caroloman's were; a very usual punishment at that time for such as were found guilty of Rebellion.

Charles the Bald being afterwards crowned Emperor by *John VIII. gave him an Account of the Judgment given at the Synod of Douzi, and desired the confirmation of it from him, which he granted, writing to Hincmarus, that upon the Relation of the Emperor he approved the Judgment, he, and other Bishops of France, had given against Hincmarus of Laon; after whom, Henedulphus was ordained Bishop of Laon, in pursuance of the Decree of his Election made March 26. and 876.

After the death of Charles the Bald, Hincmarus Bishop of The Coun. Laon was set at Liberty, who hearing that Pope John VIII. of Troyes. was retired into France, and held a Council at Troyes, he went thither and presented a Petition, in which he complained, That being carried to the Council of Douzi by force, deprived of his Goods, accused by King Charles, he was condemned by the Archbishop of Rheims, although he had appealed to the Holy See; that since that time he had been put in Chains, and his Eyes were put out. He begged of the Pope to do him Justice, and pass an equitable Sentence upon that Matter, which was referred to him. He alledged; that the Bishops of the Synod of Douzi had condemned him very unwillingly, that most of them were very much troubled at what they had done by the impulse of Hincmarus Archbishop of Rheims, who advised them to it by Writing. Nevertheless, by the Acts of the Council, and the Letters written by them, it doth appear, that they condemned Hincmarus Bishop of Laon with a full consent and agreement, and never did repent that they had done it.

Nevertheless, the Petition of Hincmarus Bishop of Laon was approved in the Council of Troyes by some Bishops, and King Ludovicus Balbus did not oppose it; But Pope John VIII. judging that it would be a very difficult thing to reverse the Sentence of the Council of Douzi, ordered that Henedulphus should continue Bishop of Laon, although he himself desired that he might retreat into a Monastery, but allowed Hincmarus liberty to sing Mass, and to have a Pension out of the Revenues of the Bishoprick of Laon. Whereupon some Bishops took him, and having clothed him with his Episcopal Vestments, they led him to the Church with Singing, and caused him to give the Benediction. He died not long after, and his Uncle Hincmarus made Prayers to God for him after his Death.

** This Pope, according to Of the Platina's reckoning, which Contest is accounted the truest, is between John IX. for John VIII. Hincmarus is Pope Joan, of which the rus and Romish Church is so much his Nephew ashamed, that they have blotted her out of the Catalogue of their Popes; for though they allow their Popes too many Women, yet they will not endure to hear of a Woman to be a Pope.*

CHAP. VI.

An Account of several other Ecclesiastical Affairs transacted in France, in which Hincmarus was chiefly engaged.

Of other Ecclesiastical Affairs in which Hincmarus was chiefly engaged.

The Divorce of the Queen Theutberga.

Hincmarus, besides the private Affairs, had also a share, as I before intimated, in all the most important Affairs both in Church and State, which gave him occasion to exercise his Pen in divers Controversies. That which made the greatest noise of all, was the Divorce of the Queen Theutberga, and Lotharius III. King of Lorrain; She was the Daughter of Hubert Duke of Outrelemonstou, and allied to Charles the Great. Lotharius being fallen in Love with another Woman, endeavoured to dissolve his Marriage, and made this the pretence, That Theutberga had committed Incest with her own Brother; He forced her to confess it, and so dissolved his Marriage by the Advice of some Bishops in an Assembly held 860. at Aix la Chapelle. Since these Bishops had given it out, that Hincmarus approved of this Divorce, he thought himself obliged to testify his Detestation of it in Writing. This Paper was made in his own, and all the Bishops Names of the Province of Rheims, and directed to Kings, Bishops, and all Christians. He first gives this reason of the Dedication, That altho' the Church of Rome ought principally to be consulted in matters obscure and dubious, yet it is convenient to address himself to the whole Church, when the ancient Truth is attacked by some Novelty; That the Matter about which he treats is of so great importance, that Kings and Princes, Magistrates, and People, ought to give great attention to the Truth of the Judgment, Consent of the Bishops, and the Lenity, Patience and Goodness of the King. Lastly, That he addressed his Speech to Kings, who ought to be an Example to the People; To the Bishops, who are obliged to teach what Christ hath commanded; And to all the Faithful, who ought neither to approve, nor favour any Man's faults. After this Preface, which he hath adorned with several passages out of the Fathers, to authorize and explain these Maxims, he answers the Reasons that are brought to maintain the Divorce of Lotharius and Theutberga; the first and chief was the Incest, which that Queen was accused to have committed with her

own Brother, by whom she is said to have conceived, and afterward procured her Abortion. She denied that she was guilty of any such Crime, and since no Proof or Witnesses could be produced for her, it was resolved by the Lay Judges, with the Advice of the Bishops, and Consent of Lotharius himself, that she should name a Man that should undergo the Tryal of hot Water; Accordingly it was put in Execution, and the Man received no hurt, so she was declared Innocent even by the Judgment of the King her Husband. Some time after, this Accusation was again renewed, and certain Bishops were summoned to the Palace of Aix la Chapelle, of which the chief were Thietgaldus Archbishop of Treves, and Gombierus Archbishop of Cologne, (the former the Uncle, and the other the Brother of Waldrada, whose Sister Lotharius desired to marry;) They made Theutberga to own that she was not fit to continue Lotharius's Wife; She called Gombierus for a Witness, to whom she had confessed it, and required him to tell the Reason of it before the other Bishops. Hincmarus, after he hath thus recited the Articles of that business, shews, that the Præmonitions that the Bishops gave the Queen, that she should not accuse her self of any Crime she was not guilty of, do evidently prove; that they knew she was to accuse her self; After which he says, that the secret Crimes which are discovered in Confession ought not to be divulged, nor ought any Person to be condemned for his secret Crimes. He also relates the Declaration of Gombierus, Jan. 8. who assured the Council, that the Queen had confessed to him that she had suffered an Abuse, tho' against her Consent; The Judgment of the Bishops, Adventinus and Thietgaldus was, that if this were true she ought not to cohabit with Lotharius; The Counsel of the Abbot Egilinus was the same; and the Extract of the Acts of the Session of that Synod held Febr. 14. (at which, besides Gombierus and Thietgaldus, were Wenilo Archbishop of Rouen, Frotharius of Tongres, or Liege, Hatto of Verdun, Hildegarius of Meaux, and Hilduinus) which contains a Declaration in writing,

writing, which the Queen gave the King her Husband, in which she owns, before God and all his Angels, that her Brother *Hubert* had abused her. 'Tis then said, that the Bishops did conjure the King to tell them, whether he had obliged her either by force, or threats, to make this Declaration, and he protested that he had not, and that he was much troubled at it; Then the Bishops asked the Queen again whether it were true, and she boldly said it was; whereupon they judged, that she ought to be put to publick Penance, to atone for the Incest which was now become publick by her Declaration. *Hincmarus* says, that Pope *Leo* forbids this sort of Confession by Writing, as to what respects the Church; That *Lotharius*, who seemed to be troubled at this, was inwardly pleased, and was the Author of this Stratagem; That the Queen, having accused her self in Judgment in the presence of the King, and his Lay-Judges, ought not to be put to publick Penance; That she was not regularly condemned, and therefore they had the less reason to divorce her so readily from her Husband, and allow him to marry another.

He then shews, that this cause was much different from *Ebbo's*, because he had chosen his Judges, before whom he regularly and judicially owned his Crime; And besides, that there is a great deal of difference between deposing a Bishop and parting Man and Wife, the Union between Husband and Wife being much more near and close than that between a Bishop and his Church; That if a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, own their Crime, although it be false that they have committed it, they ought to be deposed according to the Council of *Valence*, but a Wife cannot be parted from her Husband for the same reason; That Bishops may leave their Churches, but a Woman can't depart from her Husband.

It was farther said, that the Archbishop of *Rheims* had consented to what was done in that Assembly, and had conferred about it with *Adventius*. *Hincmarus* answers, that it was not true; that *Adventius* had indeed spoke to him of it, and invited him to be at the Synod, or send thither, but he gave him his Answer in writing, before he parted from him, that he could not do it, because he had not consulted the Bishops of his Province; and that he wrote to him after such a manner, as did shew, that he did not approve of that Divorce. Before he enters upon a particular discussion of this business, he produces several Authorities concerning the manner how a lawful Marriage ought to be contracted; he treats of the Reasons of a Separation between Man and Wife which are, according to him, the desire of their Salvation, to live Continently, and Adultery, for which the Lay-Judges part Man and Wife, with the consent of the Ecclesiastick, and the Church puts the Guilty to do publick Penance, if the Crime be known. He adds, That in the Case in hand, the Separation was neither for the love of Continence, nor for publick and certain Adultery, but only on mere suspicion, and that this Matter should first have been examined by Lay-Judges, and then the Bishops should have done their Duty, and used the Authority of the Church. He brought an Example of a Case that happened in the Reign of *Lewis the Kind*, how a Woman of Quality, named *Norbilda*, presented to a General Assembly of the State a Petition against her Husband *Argembert*. This Prince bid her apply her self to the Bishops, who should put her over to the Laymen, that they might judge of that Matter, and enjoined her to follow their Judgment, reserving to themselves a Power of putting, either her or him, to Penance, who should be convinced of any Crime.

After the Judgment by hot Water was found favourable to the Princess *Theutberga*, they that accused her said that these sort of Proofs were forbidden; *Hincmarus* endeavours to maintain them by Authority and Use, and affirms, That the Man named by the Queen to undergo the Proof of hot Water, not being so much as burnt or scalded, it was a Miracle that could not be done to authorize a Lye. He adds, That since this Judgment was not certain, and they could not accuse the Person so cleared, they ought not to make use of a secret Confession for that end.

It was also asked *Hincmarus*, if it were not possible that the Queen might have to do with her Brother, and conceive by him, without losing her Virginity? He laughs at this Proposition, and says, That if she were a Virgin when she was married, it was foolish to accuse her of being defiled, and imagine that she had conceived before her Marriage. He sent back this Question to the Lay-Judges with another, viz. Whether if a Woman, who hath not lived honestly before Marriage, but after lives honestly with her Husband, deserves to be condemned to Death for her former Lewdness, and whether it be not more fit to pardon her?

They also asked, whether the King having had to do with another Woman, after he heard that his Wife had committed this Crime, was not guilty of Adultery? He answers, that he could not deny but he was guilty, altho' at last his Wife were found guilty of the Crime for which he suspected her, because he had done it before the Sentence of Divorce was passed. He adds, that tho' a Man be engaged by Oath to

live with another Woman besides his Wife, or a Woman with another Man besides her Husband, they ought not to observe that Oath.

They also asked him, if it were true that Sorcerers could make a Man and his Wife to hate each other Mortally? He affirms that they can, and proves by several Relations that there were such Magicians and Sorcerers, and that the Devils could, by the permission of God, possess Men, make them Mad, and torment them. He owns, that if it were found, that according to the Civil and Ecclesiastical Laws, the Marriage of *Theutberga* were invalid, she might be divorced, and the King marry another; but he maintains, that till his Wife be declared unworthy to be so by the Judgment of the Lords, and Advice of the Bishops, he ought not to think of marrying his Concubine. Lastly, after he hath confuted several pretences alledged for the maintenance of the Divorce of *Lotharius* and *Theutberga*, he concludes, that the Bishops ought to oppose such disorderly proceedings, and if they did it not, or did encourage them, they were highly blameable before God.

Notwithstanding this opposition made by *Hincmarus*, there was a Synod held in 862 at *Aix la Chapelle*, in which the Bishops assembled allowed *Lotharius* to marry another Woman; whereupon he immediately married *Waldrada*. This business made a great noise, and being carried to *Rome*, Pope *Nicholas* wrote about it to King *Charles*, who desired an opportunity to quarrel with *Lotharius*, and deprive him of his Kingdom, but *Lewis* of *Germany* endeavoured to compose the Matter, and *Lotharius* referred it to the Judgment of the States; then having appealed to the Pope, two Legates were named to hold a Council, where two Bishops of *Lewis's*, and two of *Charles's* Kingdom met them, that they might judge of this Matter: this Council was held at *Metz* June 863. In it *Lotharius* went about to confirm his Marriage by the Artifices of *Gontbierus* and *Thietgaldus*, and by corrupting the Pope's Legates. *Gontbierus* and *Thietgaldus* had the boldness to bring the Sentence to *Rome*, but Pope *Nicholas*, instead of confirming it, called a Council, in which he declared the Judgment of the Synod at *Metz* null and void, deposed *Gontbierus* and *Thietgaldus*, and declared, that all the Bishops, which concurred in that Sentence, had incurred the greatest Punishment, which he resolved to inflict on them, unless they changed their Opinion.

Gontbierus and *Thietgaldus* stoutly defended themselves, and sent a Letter against Pope *Nicholas's* Sentence to all the Bishops, with a Protestation, that they had signified it to him, in which they declare him Excommunicated, because he had, as they said, gone contrary to the Canons, favouring persons excommunicated, and separating himself from the Society of other Bishops merely through Pride; but the other Prelates of *Lotharius's* Kingdom excused themselves to the Pope; *Thietgaldus* also begged Pardon, but could not obtain Absolution so long as Pope *Nicholas* lived; but *Gontbierus*, Archbishop of *Cologne*, could never be brought to beg Pardon. *Lotharius* himself did all he could to appease the Pope, who desired, that *Waldrada* should come to *Rome* in Person, and receive Absolution; she promised him, and went twice into *Italy*, but repenting as often of her submission, returned back again; wherefore the Pope having called a Synod excommunicated her, and wrote several sharp Letters to *Lotharius* the Younger. Afterward he sent a Legate into *France* named *Assenius*, who, addressing himself to *Lewis* of *Germany*, called a Synod, in which *Lotharius* was forced to take his former Wife, but as soon as the Legate was gone he began to use her ill, and to enter a Process against her for Adultery, so that she was forced to put her self under the Protection of King *Charles*; the Pope was very much concerned at it, and excommunicated *Waldrada* a-new.

At the same time, there were two other Matters of like nature debated between *Hincmarus*, the Bishops of the Kingdom, and *Charles* on the one part; and *Gontbierus*, and the Bishops of *Lotharius's* Kingdom on the other. The one was about *Judith* the Daughter of King *Charles*, the Widow of the King of *England*, who was taken away from *Senlis* by Earl *Baldwin*, who was fled into the Kingdom of *Lotharius*; and the other concerning *Ingeltrude* the Wife of *Boson*, who had left her Husband, and was fled into the Diocese of *Gontbierus*. As to the first of these, it was soon ended by the Intercession of Pope *Nicholas*, for Earl *Baldwin*, whom he had excommunicated at the Solicitation of King *Charles*, coming to *Rome* with *Judith*, cast himself at the Pope's feet; at which he was so much moved, that he wrote several Letters to King *Charles*, his Queen *Hermentruda*, and the Bishops, to obtain their Pardon; by which means the King consented to the Marriage, and so it ended.

As to the Wife of *Boson*, *Gontbierus* wrote about her to *Hincmarus*, An. 860. propounding the Question thus to him: if this Woman come to me, and tell me that she hath committed Adultery, desiring that I would protect her from Death, which she is afraid of from her Husband, ought I to put her to publick Penance in my Diocese, at a distance from her Husband, or shall I send her again to her Husband, making

Of other Ecclesiastical Affairs

Council of Metz.

A Council at Rome.

The Business of Judith and Baldwin. *Ethelbald whose Father Ethelwulf had her to wife before.

The Business of Boson.

making him promise that he will not put her to Death? *Hincmarus* answers, That he ought not to put another Man's Wife to Penance who belongs to another Diocess, nor protest her; That *Boson* doth not accuse her of Adultery, but complains, That she hath left him, and promises that he will do her no Harm; So that all you can do upon this Occasion is this, That the King of the Country, whither she is fled, should make her return to her Husband, but withal, taking such Security of her Husband, as is usual to be given for those who have put themselves under the Protection of the Church.

There was also another Business of the like Nature, in which *Hincmarus* was engaged; Count *Raimond* had marry'd a Daughter to a certain Lord named *Stephen*, who would not live with her as his Wife, under a Pretence that she had had a Carnal Knowledge of one of her near Relations, but would not tell who it was. Earl *Raimond* wrote a Letter of Complaint about it to the Synod held at *Toussi*, 860. whereupon *Stephen* was summoned to the Synod, where he propounded the Business, and told them, That whereas in his Youth he had had a Carnal Knowledge of one of the near Relations of the Daughter of Earl *Raimond*, it happened that he desired to have her in Marriage, and obtained it; but afterward calling to mind what he had formerly done, he went to a Confessor to know whether he might not do Penance for his Sin in Private, and marry the Earl's Daughter, as they had agreed? The Confessor answered, No; and shewing him a Book, which he said was a Book of Canons, by which it was decreed, That he that hath had any Carnal Knowledge of the Woman's Relations, whom he would marry, must not consummate the Marriage with her; That afterward falling under the Displeasure of the King his Lord, he was forced to leave the Kingdom, without breaking of the Contract with *Raimond's* Daughter, or marrying her, so that it was put off for some time; That afterward he was constrained to marry her publicly, but for fear he should damn his Soul, he would not have any Carnal Knowledge of her. This he assured the Council, with an Oath, that it was true, and that he did not do it for Interest, or because he loved another Woman; declaring, That he was ready to follow the Judgment of the Bishops, if they could satisfy him that his Honour and Salvation might be alike secured, in giving Contentment to his Father-in-Law and Wife. The Synod resolved, that it was necessary to call a Council of Bishops and Lords, at which the King himself should be present; That the Lords should examine the Business, and the Bishops conclude it. *Stephen* accepted this Condition, and *Hincmarus* was employed by the Council to search into the Truth of the Matter, by which he was obliged to write to the Archbishops of *Bourges* and *Bourdeaux*, and the Bishops of their Provinces. He tells them, That they ought to bring *Raimond's* Daughter to the Assembly, and enquire of her, whether it was true that her Husband had no Carnal Knowledge of her; That it ought to be searched into, whether *Stephen* did not say this that he might leave his Wife; That he ought to name the near Relation he had known; That he ought to swear it was true; and if it did appear to be true, that he had really done so with any of her near Relations, they shou'd be parted, and *Stephen* should be put to publick Penance.

In 842. Nov. 1. *Hincmarus* held a Council at *Rheims* with the Priests of his Diocess, in which several very useful Constitutions were made. They decreed and ordered, That all Priests should know how to explain the Creed and Lord's Prayer, and be able to repeat by Heart the Preface and Canon of the Mass, and recite distinctly the Psalms, Hymns, and *Athanasius's* Creed; That they should know how to administer Baptism, absolve Penitents, and anoint the Sick; That on every Sunday they should consecrate Water, and burn Incense after the Gospel and Offertory; That they should distribute the Holy Bread to all those that would not communicate; That they should read the 40. Homilies of St. *Gregory*; That they should know the Kalendar, and how to sing, and should sing the Service; That they should take Care of the Poor and Sick; That they should not pawn the Holy Vessels; That they should not bury any Man in the Church, without Permission from the Bishop, and should demand nothing for Burials; That they should take no Gifts of Penitents; That when they meet at Feasts they should be sober; That when they meet at Conferences they should not make any Feasts, but be contented with Bread, and two or three Glasses of Wine, and no more; That Fraternities should be upheld for Piety-sake, and none should be suffered to promote Feasting and Revels; And lastly, That when any Priest died, no Man should get Possession of his Church without the Bishop's Order.

He gave also, at the same time, to the Prebends and Deans that were to visit his Diocess, some Articles of Enquiry, viz. What Titles every Priest had, and by whom he was ordain'd; What is the Revenue of his Living, and how many Houses in his Parish; In what Condition the Ornaments of his Church are, and how the Relicks are preserved; If there be a Place to throw the Water in, with which the Vessels of the Altar and Ornaments are washed; If the

Holy Oils were kept locked up; If there be a Clergyman that keeps School; In what Case the Church is, and whether it be in good Repair; Whether the Tithes be divided into three Parts, and an Account be given of two of them to the Bishops; Whether there be any Church-Wardens; Whether the Church-Revenues be improved, and no private Advantage made of them; If the Clergy live orderly, and do not familiarly converse with Women, frequent Ale-Houses; How those that are vicious should be reprov'd, and for what Crime they may be condemned and degraded.

In 857. which was the 12th. Year of *Hincmarus's* Bishoprick, June 9. he held another Synod, in which he added some other Rules, which ordered, That Publick Sinners should be put to Penance in Publick by the Authority of the Bishops, to whom the Curates are obliged to send them; That if they do not present themselves to receive them, after they have been advertised of it by the Priests, they shall be excommunicated within 15. Days; That they shall require nothing for Burials, and no Man shall celebrate Mass but upon a consecrated Altar or Table. He also made some other Constitutions in 874. in July, commanding, That Priests, Curates, and Prebends, should reside in their Benefices, and not retire into Monasteries; That they should take nothing to make Church-Wardens, and should allow those that are chosen a Part of their Tithes, to be employ'd about the Buildings, and Ornaments of the Church; That Priests should not be familiar with Women, nor enrich themselves with the Revenues of the Church; That they should give nothing to Patrons to be nominated to any vacant Church.

These are the Constitutions which *Hincmarus* made for the Priests, but lest the Archdeacons, who are to put them in Execution in their Visits, should not give them in Charge to the Curates, he made, July, 877. an Order, in which he forbids them to go their Visitations with many Attendants, or Horses, to require or exact any thing of them, to stay long with them; Not to meddle with the Division of Parishes, to make the Ancient Churches to be still subject to their Parishes, in which there have always been Priests; to suffer no Man to have a Chappel without the Permission of the Archbishop; to discharge no Penitents through Favour before they have done their Penance, nor to ordain any Persons not duly qualified, nor to settle any Deans without the Authority of the Bishops.

After these Constitutions follows, in the Works of *Hincmarus*, a Recital of the Ceremonies and Prayers used at the Coronation of *Charles the Bald* for the Kingdom of *Lotharing*, celebrated at *Meitz* by *Hincmarus*, Sept. 8. 869. as also at the Coronation of *Lewis*, Dec. 8. 877. and of *Judith* the Daughter of *Charles*, when she was married to *Ethelwulf* King of *England*, An. 856. as also of Queen *Hermenetrude*, celebrated at *Soissons*.

Hincmarus also, in a Letter to *Charles the Bald*, gives various Instructions to Princes out of the Fathers, which he lays down as undoubted Truths, viz. That God makes good Kings, and permits bad ones; That a good Prince is the greatest Happiness of the People, and a bad one their greatest Misfortune; That a wise Government is the greatest Proof of great Power; That a King should choose wise, experienced, and virtuous Men; That nothing is better than for Rulers to know how they ought to rule; That it is most profitable, that good Kings have the greatest Kingdoms; That Necessity only should make them make War; That War is lawful, if it be just; That God gives the Victory to whom he pleases; That they ought to be prayed for that dye in Battles; That Kings serve God by making Laws for his Honour; That they are obliged to compel Men to do Good, and punish them justly; That they may sometimes shew Favour, but they should be careful they do it not unfitly; That they should be continually upon their Guard, that they be not surprized by their Favourites or Flatterers; They should have no wicked Men about them, nor pardon their Relations; That they ought to mix Justice with Mercy. After he hath thus spoken of a Prince, as endued with Kingly Powers, he then lays down the Virtues of a Prince considered as a Christian, which is nothing but a Collection of Texts of Scripture, and Sentences of the Fathers, concerning the Duties of a Christian Life. He hath also a third Letter to the same King, concerning the Nature of the Soul; He holds that it is Spiritual, not confined to a Place, and doth not move locally, altho' it changes its Will and Manners. He also moves this Question, Whether we shall see God, in another World, by the Eyes of our Body, or only by the Eyes of the Soul?

In the Year 858. *Lewis*, Emperor of *Germany*, entred *Charles's* Kingdom to invade him, while he was gone to War against the *Britains* and *Normans*; *Hincmarus*, and the other Bishops of his Diocess, whom he had told the States that they must stay at *Rheims*, sent a Remonstrance to him, in which they tell him plainly, That he was unjust to his Brother, in entering into his Kingdom in an Hostile Manner, exhorting him to make Peace with him, to turn his Arms against the *Pagans*, to preserve the Privileges of the Church,

A Synod of Rheims in 857, and 874.

The Constitutions of Hincmarus in 877.

The Coronations of Kings.

Some Instructions of Hincmarus to Charles the Bald.

Hincmarus's Address to Lewis of Germany.

Church, and suffer no Man to rob it of its Revenues; to the same those Monasteries of the Monks which are in the Possession of Laymen, to take Care that the Monks live according to their Rule, and that the Revenues of Hospitals should be disposed of rightly by the Overseers, with the Authority of the Bishops. He then gives him some Directions how he ought to live and reign, and how he ought to govern the General Synod of France.

In 859 *Charles* being ready to march against *Lewis*, *Hincmarus* wrote to him to hinder the Disorders and Pillaging which the Soldiers used to make. He also admonishes the Churchmen at Court, by another Letter, to hinder the Soldiers, which were used to pillage, to do it again. Lastly, he admonisheth the Priests of the Diocess of *Rheims* to excommunicate them, who, after Admonition, should continue to pillage any.

In 875, after the Death of *Lewis* King of *Italy*, and Emperor, *Charles the Bald* being gone into *Italy* to be crowned Emperor, and possess himself of *Italy*, *Lewis* of *Germany* falls upon *France* to give him a Diversion; *Hincmarus* presents him with a long Petition full of Quotations of the Fathers, to stop him in this Enterprize, and it was effectual.

The same Year *John* Bishop of *Cambray* was written to by *Hincmarus*, who gave him Directions how he should deal with the Priest *Hamoldus*, who was suspected of an unlawful Familiarity with a Woman. He says, That the Custom of the Province hath been to make Enquiries about the Priest who is thus charged and defamed, that their Witnesses must be sworn, and interrogated concerning his frequent Conversation and Familiarity with Women; That after the Deposition of 3. Witnesses, there ought to be a 7th. to prove the Fact; That if there be no Witnesses, but it be only a common Report, the Priest must clear himself by the Oath of 6. of his Neighbouring Priests.

Some time after, in 875, he condemned a Priest of his Diocess himself, named *Gualdus*, who was accused of conversing with a Woman; the Fact was proved, but the Priest fled from Judgment. The Instrument of this Priest's Deposition is among *Hincmarus*'s Works. In the same Year he excommunicated *S. Aderus* and *Hardus*, who married their near Relations, and would not be parted from them.

In the Year 876, Pope *John VIII.* named for his Vicar in *France* and *Germany*, *Ansegisus* Archbishop of *Sens*. This Privilege being prejudicial to the Church of *Rheims*, and the Authority of *Hincmarus*, he wrote a large Treatise to defend the Rights of Metropolitans against the new Pretences of these Vicars; and in particular, glories much in the Rights and Privileges of the Church of *Rheims*. He cites a Letter of Pope *Honorius*, in which he makes *Ramizius* his Vicar in *France*; and a Bull of *Benedict*, which asserts, That all Persons in the Province of *Rheims* are subject to their Metropolitans, and that no Man can go before any other Judges, without the License to the Right of the Holy See. He adds, That he would not refuse to meet at a Synod of several Provinces, provided that it be called either by the Pope, or Emperor, because the first General Councils were called by the Emperors; and *St. Gregory* himself bids the Kings of *France* to assemble Synods in their Realms. He observes, that *Boniface* Bishop of *Maince*, whom the Pope had made his Vicar in *France* and *Germany*, had never encroached upon the Rights of the Metropolitans; That *Drogon* Bishop of *Metz*, having obtained the same Prerogative of Pope *Sergius*, could not enjoy it, because they, who sustained any Loss by it, would not acknowledge him.

Ansegisus's Letter of Privilege was brought to the Council held June 19. at *Posidon*, where the Pope's Legates were met to represent the Pope. The Emperor, who was present, asked the Bishops what they had to say against the Pope's Bull. They answered, They were ready to obey it, so far as was consistent with the Rights of their Metropolitans, according to the Canons and Decrees made and confirmed by the Popes, agreeable to the Laws of the Church. The Emperor, and the Pope's Legates, urged them to approve the Privilege granted to *Ansegisus*, without any Restrictions, but they persisted in the Exception, only *Frotardus*, Archbishop of *Bordeaux*, answered as the Emperor desired, being willing to be translated to *Bourges*, because his Country was ravaged. The Emperor insisted on it, That the Pope had named *Ansegisus* to keep his Place in the Synod, and he had set him above all the Bishops of his Realm, on the side of the Pope's Legates. *Hincmarus* exclaimed against it, and publicly complained, That they had done a thing contrary to the Canons of the Church. The Question was revived again in another Session, July 14. in which the Bishops protested, That they would obey the Pope's Letters in the same Manner that their Predecessors had obeyed his Predecessors, according to the Constitutions. This Answer satisfied the Emperor and Pope's Legates somewhat more, but the Business being again debated in the last Session, they explained themselves in the same Manner that they had done in the first Session; so that *Ansegisus* could gain nothing more of them.

In the same Synod *Hincmarus*, and the other Archbishops, were forced to take an Oath of Fidelity openly to the Em-

peror. This Action much displeased *Hincmarus*, so that he made several Observations upon the Terms, in which the Oath was expressed; but that which troubled him most was, That his Fidelity seemed to be questioned, in requiring of him a new Oath of Fidelity, who had for so many Years served his Prince faithfully. The same Year he composed *Hincmarus* a Writing, to shew that the Land of *Neuilly* belonged to the Church of *Rheims*.

In the Year 877, *Hincmarus* wrote a Letter to the Pope in the Name of *Charles the Bald*, about the Appeals of Priests to the Holy See. Several Priests justly and canonically condemned by their Bishops went to *Rome*, and surreptitiously obtained Letters of Absolution. This Abuse freed Criminals from Punishment, weakened and disannulled the Bishops Authority, and quite destroyed the Order and Discipline of the Church: So that to stop the Course of these Actions, the Emperor wrote a Letter to the Pope, in which, after a Collection of Canons which respected the Judgment of the Bishops and Priests, he prayed him to observe them, and conform to the Council of *Sardica*, in the Appeals of Bishops; and as to Priests, they ought by the Canons to be judged by their Bishops, and can't appeal from the Judgment of their Bishop and Metropolitan. In the End, he prays the Pope to admonish the Bishops that they be moderate in their Judgments, and not suffer themselves to be transported either with Passion or Pride.

Charles the Bald died a little time after, and left for his Successor his Son *Lewis Balbus*, or the *Stammerer*, who was crowned by *Hincmarus*, Dec. 8. 877. Soon after this Archbishop sent him a Paper of Directions how to govern his Realm; He advises him to prevent all Disagreements among his great Men, to assemble them, and take their Advice in Government, to put in Execution the Ordinance made by his Father concerning the Honour of Bishops, and Privileges of Churches, to keep his Subjects in Peace and Unity, to oppose the Inroads of the *Britains*, and hold Friendship and Correspondence with the Kings his Cousins. He exhorts him to pray to God, that he may attain an Heavenly Felicity, administer Justice, and live like a Christian.

About the same time, upon the Occasion of the Election of the Bishop of *Beauvais*, he wrote a Treatise of the Duties of a Bishop and his Functions, which are to sing the Publick Service of the Church, consecrate the Chrism, to administer Baptism according to the Tradition of the Church, and to take Care that the Priests also baptize; to ordain Priests, Deacons, and other Orders of the Clergy, at the Time set apart by the Church, to call Synods of Priests, to go to Provincial Synods, and to assist at the Ordination of Bishops, when he is invited, or to send a Priest and a Deacon to excuse him; to govern his Clergy, and furnish the Church with all Things necessary; to have Hospitals to receive the Poor and Passengers, to have a Care of the Monasteries in his Diocess, and the Country-Parishes, to preach the Word of God to the People, to confirm, impose Publick Penance, absolve those that have gone through with it, to have a Care of all the Revenues of his Church, to serve the Prince in his Wars for the Defence of his Church, to make a good Use of the Church-Revenues, to know and observe the Holy Canons.

Lewis the Stammerer dying in 879. left two Sons, *Lewis* and *Carloman*; These two Princes having many Enemies lying upon them, had need of the Emperor's Protection, who was *Charles the Great*. *Hincmarus* wrote to him, to thank him for the Kindness he seemed to have for these young Princes, and to desire him to protect the Church, and to appoint these Princes some Counsellors and Tutors, who might have a Care to educate them well, and to teach them all Virtues necessary for Princes.

At the Beginning of the Reign of *Lewis III.* the Church of *Beauvais* having been vacant some time, *Hincmarus*, and the Bishops of his Province of *Rheims*, being met in *St. Mary's* Church, proceeded to the Election of a Bishop, and chose *Odo*. The Clergy and People of *Beauvais* had before chosen two, one after another, but they were rejected as incapable, by reason of their Ignorance and corrupt Manners. The Bishops, who had chosen *Odo*, had wrote to the King, to pray him, that he would leave the Election of their Bishops to their Metropolitan, and the Bishops of their Province, with the Consent of the People and Clergy, and after they would present the Bishop chosen to him, that he might put him into the Possession of the Revenues of the Church, which was under his Protection; And when this is obtain'd, he shall be ordain'd by the Bishops. The King pretending to name him whom he would have, who was already chosen, refused to grant the Bishops Request, and wrote to *Hincmarus*, That his Intention was to govern and dispose both Ecclesiastical and Civil Matters, and desired him to be obedient to him, as he had been to his Predecessors; And that he would have the Church of *Beauvais* given to *Odacer*, in whom the Votes of the People concurred with him. *Hincmarus* answered him, That the Election of Bishops ought to be left to the Bishops, Clergy and People; that he ought not to force them to choose the Person he had named to them; That the Ecclesiastical Laws, which give Power

of electing Bishops, were revived in the Ordinances of the Kings his Predecessors; That he was not Lord over the Church-Revenues, to dispose of them as he pleased. He puts him in mind of the Profession he made at his Coronation to protect the Church; That as for *Odacer*, he could never endure that he should be Bishop of *Beauvais*; and if he put him in Possession of the Church, he would not permit him to execute the Orders of his Priesthood in his Diocese; That he ought not to be ordained, although he was chosen by the Suffrages of the Clergy and People of *Beauvais* unanimously, because they having elected two unfit Persons successively, the Right of Election was fallen to the Bishops.

King *Lewis* having again earnestly solicited *Hincmarus* by a second Letter to grant his Request, and to approve of the Election of *Odacer* to the Bishoprick of *Beauvais*, he answered him with greater Retention than before; and when *Odacer* was put in Possession of the Revenues of that Church against his Will, he excommunicated him by a Circular Letter directed to all Priests, and all the Faithful of the Church.

Lastly, *Lewis* being dead, and *Caroloman* only remaining King of *France*, *Hincmarus*, according to his Custom, sent an Instruction to him how he ought to govern himself. It is written with Gravity and Authority. He inserts the Duties of the King's Servants, and Counsellors of State.

It is not certain to what King *Hincmarus* dedicated his Letters against Rapes, a Vice common in those Ages; He proves, both by the Ecclesiastical and Civil Laws, That that Crime ought to be punished severely; that Marriages with ravish'd Women are forbidden, and that Kings ought neither to tolerate them, nor compel Fathers to consent to them.

He hath also made a Treatise about the Proof by Water; sent to *Hildegard* Bishop of *Meaux*, either when Men, to prove their Innocency, are dipped in Scalding Water without burning, or when they cast themselves into cold Water, and yet swim on the Top of the Water; and endeavours to justify this Custom, but the greatest part of his Reasons are meer Sophisms, which are destroyed by the Principle which forbids us to tempt God.

He hath also a Letter written to *Hildegard* Bishop of *Souffens*, who being sick, had sent him a General Confession of his Sins in Writing, praying him to give him his Letters of Absolution. He writes to him again, That by the Apostolick Authority he absolved him of all his Sins, and prayed God to forgive them to him by the Grace of his Holy Spirit, to deliver him from all Evil, to keep him in perpetual Peace and Safety, and guide him to Eternal Life. These are the Terms in which he gave him Absolution; To which he also added, That not being able to come to him and pronounce it himself, he hoped his Ministers and Priests would do it: And tells him, That he had sent by one of them the Holy Oil, with which being anointed, he shall receive Remission of his Sins. He exhorts him also to make, besides this General Confession, a particular one to God, and a Priest; and adds some Precepts about a true Conversion.

The Form of Episcopal Ordination which he sent to *Adventinus* Bishop of *Metz*, is very remarkable. He says, That the Bishops of the Province ought to meet the *Saturday* before the Bishop Elect is to be ordain'd, and there openly read the Decree for his Election, and the Bishops must demand if their Votes are unanimously for him, if he hath all Virtues requisite for a Bishop, and no Man hath any Thing to say against him. Then they ought to ordain him according to a Canon of the Council of *Carthage*. That on the Lord's-day, the Bishops, Clergy, and People, ought to meet in the Place where the Metropolitan useth to ordain. That the Person elected ought to go out of the Vestry clothed with his Pontifical Vestments, and take the lowest Seat among the Bishops. That the Metropolitan shall begin the Service as far as the *Gloria*. That after the *Gloria*, he shall read the Prayer for the Consecration; and when that's ended, he shall exhort the People to pray for him who is to be ordain'd, and for them that ordain him. That taking him by the Hand, he shall kneel down before the Altar with all the Bishops his Associates, while they read the Litany. That when the *Agnus Dei* is begun to be sung, they shall rise up. That the Metropolitan shall take the Gospels, and lay them upon the Neck and Shoulders of him that is to be ordained; That that Book shall be held by him that consecrates him, and two other Bishops: That all three of them shall lay their Hands upon the Head of the Person to be ordained, and he that consecrates him shall read the Prayer. Then he shall go on with the Service, and when he comes at the Places marked with the Crosses, the Bishop, that consecrates him, shall take the Vessel of Holy Oil in his Left-hand, and taking some of it with his Thumb of his Right-hand, shall make Crosses upon the Crown of the Head of the Person that is to be ordained, reading the Prayers in that place. This being done, and all the Congregation saying *Amen*, they shall take the Gospels from the Neck of him that is to be ordain'd, put the *Agnus* upon his Finger, and give him the Pastoral Staff; After which he shall take his Place among the Bishops, viz. The first,

VOL. II.

if he be a Metropolitan, and the last, if he be a single Bishop. Then they shall read the Place in the Epistle to *Timothy*, where he speaks of the Qualifications of a Bishop; and when the Service is ended, they shall lead him to the Episcopal Chair, from whence he shall return into the Vestry, and then shall come out again to celebrate the Sacrament. Then they shall give him a Testimonial of Ordination. — * *Hincmarus* opposes the Translation of Bishops in a Writing composed upon that Subject, upon the Occasion of the Translation of *Aclardus* Bishop of *Nantes* to the Archbishoprick of *Tours*. He proves, that according to the Laws of the Church, and the Tradition of the Apostles, the Translation of Bishops is forbidden, altho' in some Cases these sort of Translations are permitted for the Good of the Church. The only lawful Reasons for Translations, according to him, are these, The Necessity of preaching the Gospel, and the Peoples refusing to accept a Bishop. As for the Persecution of a Bishop in his Diocese, he shews, that it is not a sufficient Reason for Translation; and that according to the Law and Canons, a Bishop persecuted, or driven out of his Diocese, ought only to remain in another in the Quality of a Bishop, but there is no necessity he should be a Titular Bishop in another Church. As to the particular Case of *Aclardus*, that he might have remained in the vacant Church, where the Council permitted him to remain without removing to the Church of *Tours*, and that 'twas not heard of that he might be Archbishop of *Tours*, and yet retain the Right which he hath to the Church of *Nantes*. *Aclardus* excused himself, because he had not sufficient Revenues in the Church of *Nantes* to live honourably according to his Quality, but *Hincmarus* says, That that Pretence is by no means a lawful Excuse, but on the contrary, proves his Covetousness, and so much the more, because he had elsewhere Abbies, and an Estate sufficient for his Maintenance and Expence. There are in this Treatise a great many excellent Citations out of the Fathers, and some very good Precepts against the Covetousness and Ambition of Bishops.

His Treatise of the Accusations and Judgments of Priests, is a Collection of the Ecclesiastical and Civil Laws upon that Subject; in it he shews, what Persons may accuse Priests, the Quality, and Number of the Witnesses, the Judge before whom they ought to be accused, which is the Bishop, the Judgment from which they may appeal to the Metropolitan, the common Subjects for which they may be accused, the Manner how they ought to clear themselves when there are no Witnesses nor Proofs against them. He confutes the Opinion of some Persons who held, that a Priest, or Bishop, could not be accused by their Inferiors. He shews the Falshood and Impertinence of a Decree taken out of the forged Acts of Pope *Silvester*. He owns, That for Causes Civil and Pecuniary, a Clergyman may be summoned before a Lay-Judge, and ought to answer before him by his Attorney. Lastly, he is of Opinion, that the Estates of Clergymen, all Ecclesiastical Revenues, and Oblations of the Faithful, do belong to the Church. He orders, That all Bishops Officers should be careful to inform them, whether that Part of the Tenth, which ought to be distributed to the Poor, be appropriated to the Church, and whether they take any Presents of any Man to put them in the Registers of the Church, or require of them any Sort of Service; whether they do not put in their Kindred; and lastly, if they look after the Poor and Infirm of their Parishes.

Hincmarus applies the Laws, which he had laid down for the Judgment of Priests, to the particular Fact of a certain Priest called *Teutfrid*, who had taken away the Ornaments of the Church: He shews, first, That he ought to be judged in his Province, either by his Bishop, or by a Council; That if he hath confessed, or is convicted of having conveyed away the Ornaments, he should be condemned to make Restitution, deposed and excommunicated; If it be found that he hath rejected the Judgment of the Church to have Recourse to the Prince, he ought also to be excommunicated, and deposed, according to the Canons of the Councils at *Antioch* and *Carthage*; That if he confesses, or be convicted to have sworn falsely to his Neighbours in his own Behalf, he ought to be condemned as a perjured Person, and that he ought not to be excused, by saying, That he was forced, or by putting another Sense upon his Words, because God can't be deceived by such Equivocations; and that we ought not so much to consider the Words of him that swears, as what is meant by him that imposes the Oath.

The Relation of the Vision of *Bernoldus* is worth our Notice, because of the Circumstances of what happened to that Person, who being fallen sick, made his Confession, received Absolution, Unction with the Holy Oil, and the Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ: That afterward he fell into such a Condition, that he could not speak, nor take any thing but a little Water, and when he had remained thus three Days, on the fourth Day about Noon, he became utterly senseless, but coming to himself about Midnight, he called for his Confessor, who being come, and having

The Vision of B. Bernoldus.

Of other
Ecclesiasti-
cal Affairs
in which
Hincmar-
us was
chiefly
engaged.

having made such Prayers as are usual upon such Occasions, he told him he had been in another World, and had seen 41. Bishops in a certain Place, among whom were *Ebbo*, *Pardulus*, and *Aeneas*, who seemed to him to be mangled, and black, as if they had been burnt, quaking sometimes for Cold, and sometimes scorched with Heat; That *Ebbo* calling him to him, said to him, Since you have a Permission to go into the other World, we pray thee to do us this Service, as to bid the Priests and Laymen of our Diocesis to pray, and offer Sacrifice, and give Alms for us; That *Bernoldus* answering, That he knew not where to find them, they ordered a Person to conduct him, who brought him to a large Palace, where there were a great Number of Bishops; That returning from this Walk, he came to the first Bishops, whom he found in a better Condition, and more merry than they were the first time, who told him, That he had freed them from the evil Guardian they had, and had put them into a State of Rest; That afterward he saw the Emperor *Charles* in another Place, who charged him to tell *Hincmarus* that he was in Torments for not following his good Advice, and that he prayed him to help him, and deliver him from those Pains by his Prayers; That after this, he was carried into a Place full of Light, where he saw *Hincmarus* ready to sing Mass, and that being discharged of his Commission, at his return he found *Charles* in a light Place, and in a good Condition; That he also met with *Jesse*, and saw several poor Souls tormented by the Devils in Lakes of Fire; That he also saw Earl *Archieus*, who charged him to bid his Wife pray to God for him; That he was dismissed by a Man of an honest Countenance, who exhorted him to abound in good Works, that he might have an happy Station in another World, and promised him that he should live 14. Years. That *Bernoldus*, after he had related these Things, received the Communion, and then eat and drank. *Hincmarus* hearing of this, (and believing it true, because he had read of such like Visions in *St. Gregory's* Dialogues, and heard, that the like had happened to a certain Monk named *Wetinus*, in the Reign of the Emperor *Lewis the Kind* (or *Godly*) he took an Occasion from hence to exhort all the People of his Diocesis to live well, and recommended it to them to pray for King *Charles*, and for all others, whom this restored Person had seen, interpreting what they had said in this Sense, That if they did what they desired, they should receive the Comfort which they longed for.

A Relation
of King
Pepin's
Repentance

Towards the End of *Hincmarus's* Works is a Piece added concerning the Repentance of King *Pepin*; This Prince being delivered by the Lords of *Aquitain* to his Brother *Charles*, and confined to the Monastery of *St. Medard* at *Soissons*, An. 852. made his Escape out of that Monastery, and fled to the *Normans*, who then ravaged *France*, but was taken again. *Hincmarus* consulting with himself how he ought to be dealt with, made this Treatise, and in it concludes, that he ought to be exhorted to make a sincere and general Confession of all his Sins in Secret, and Publickly acknowledge his Fault in leaving his Monastery, being perjured, and made no better than an Heathen, and do his publick Penances; that then he may be reconciled, receive the Clerical Tonsure, and put on a Monk's Habit, promising to live regularly for the future. And after this he may take the Communion, but must be treated civilly and kindly, and left at Liberty in the Monastery, yet the Monks ought to observe strictly, that he doth not relapse into the same Fault, nor escape, as he hath already done from the Monastery of *St. Medard*, and as *Caroloman* had done from the Monastery of *Corbey*.

Several
Letters of
Hincmar-
us.

At the End of *Hincmarus's* Works are some Fragments of his Letters taken out of *Hodoardus*: The first is taken out of a Letter written to King *Charles the Bald*, concerning the Manner how he ought to administer Justice to the Bishops; The second is out of a Letter to *Lewis* Emperor of *Germany*, about the Ordination of *Bertulphus* to the Archbishoprick of *Treves*; This Church had been a long time vacant, and *Hincmarus* ordained *Bertulphus* to it. *Lewis* of *Germany* was angry at it, as an Encroachment upon the Rights of his Kingdom, and an Intrusion upon a Church that did not belong to him; wherefore *Hincmarus* wrote to him to excuse himself, and says, that he undertook that Ordination for the Good of the Church; that he thought, since there were not Bishops enow in the Province of *Treves* to ordain a Metropolitan, it belonged to him, who was the next Archbishop, to do it; and so much the rather, because the Churches of *Rheims* and *Treves* were looked upon as Sisters, and the Custom in the Councils was, that the most ancient of those two Churches should have the Precedency of the other. That indeed, he had not concerned himself with that Ordination, but by the Entreaty of the Church of *Treves*, by whom *Bertulphus* was generally approved of; That he was resolved to maintain what he had done, and to defend the Validity of this Ordination; That

so long as he lived he would acknowledge *Bertulphus* Archbishop of *Treves*, unless he were Canonically deposed; That *Walto*, who had invaded that Church, should never be acknowledged by him for a lawful Bishop, and if he persisted in his Claim they would condemn him.

Of other
Ecclesiasti-
cal Affairs
in which
Hincma-
rus was
chiefly en-
gaged.

In another Letter written to the Monks of *St. Dennis*, he forbids them to sell their Tythes, and convert the Price of them to their own Advantage. In the 4th. directed to an Earl, he forbids him taking any Thing for his Nomination to a Church, and tells him, That if a Person capable of a Place be presented to him, he will ordain him, if he will vouch that he hath given nothing for it, if not, he shall put in another. He complains, that there was a Person put into the Register of the Church who had given a Present to have his Name written into it.

In the Fragment of the 5th. Letter, he assures *Hermen-gardis*, *Lotharius's* Queen, that he never was unfaithful to the Emperor her Husband.

The 6th. is an Admonition to the Nuns, about the Election of an Abbess [for the Monastery of *St. Croffe*.] The last is a Fragment of a Treatise of *Hincmarus's*, intituled, *Ferculum Solomonis*, taken out of *Durandus* Abbot of *Troarn*, who says that this Treatise of *Hincmarus* was in Verse; That which we have in the End of the first Tome of this Author's Works is in Prose, and seems to be a second Part of that Work. The first is lost, and we have not spoken of the other, because it contains nothing in it but some Mystical Notions and Meditations.

There are two other Treatises of *Hincmarus* of the same Nature, the one upon these Words of the Psalmist, *Herodii Domus Dux est illorum*; and the other upon the Mystical Name which he had given to the Council of *Nice*, in which he affirms, That it deserves that Name, because the Number of 318. which was the Number of the Bishops present at it, is a Mystical Number.

By what we have said of the Life, Actions and Writings of *Hincmarus*, it is plain that he was better versed in the Canons and Discipline of the Church, than in the Studies of Ecclesiastical Doctrines; He had read the Writings of the Councils well, and had made Collections of the Passages of their Writings, and Canons, upon all Sorts of Subjects; He knew how to use them dexterously, and convert them easily to his own Advantage; He was a great Politician, and knew very well how to use the Laws of the Church to bring about his Intentions and Designs; The *French* Church is much beholding to him for his Vigor in defending her Liberties, and the Dignity of her Bishops and Metropolitans, against the Attempts that the Popes had made upon their Rights, yet without depriving the Holy See of the Respect and Subjection that was due to it; He found out a Way to oppose the unjust Pretences of the Court of *Rome*, without making a Schism, or slighting the Holy See.

Judgment
upon Hinc-
marus.

But it was not against the Popes only, that he maintained the Rights of the Church, he also defended them against the Kings, and tho' he was much in Favour, yet he courageously defended his Rights, by telling them freely what was their Duty. Some Persons may, perhaps, blame him for intermeddling so much with Affairs of State, but this may be sufficiently justified by the Usage of *France* in his Time, where the Bishops were looked upon not only as the Spiritual Pastors of the Church, but as the Principal Members of the State.

His Style is fitter a great Deal for Precepts and Instructions, than for Works of Doctrine or Eloquence, for 'tis clear and plain, but neither smooth nor elegant; the Faults which are to be met withal in reading his Works, are recompensed by Abundance of excellent Rules and Authorities for the Government of the Church; There is no Author, where we meet with such plenty and so well authorized, and from whom we can know the Rights of the Church so well; Altho' he doubted of the Falshood of the forged Decretals of the Popes, yet he quotes them often, but 'tis usually when they are agreeable to the Common Right, for when they disagree he rejects them, and grounds himself chiefly upon the Canons of the General Councils, or other Councils received and approved by the Church, and upon the Decretals of the Popes, which are agreeable to that Discipline.

A Part of his Works were printed at *Mayence*, [by the Care of *John Busiens*] in 1602. and at *Paris* in 1615. by *Cordeus*, [who added several Tracts of *Hincmarus* to the former Edition] but Father *Sirmondus* put out a much larger Edition in 2. Vol. in Folio, printed at *Paris* by *Cramoisy* in 1645. Since Father *Celot* published in 1658. four little Pieces of his against *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, [with learned Notes of his own, and joined to them the Council of *Donzi*] which are also inserted in the 8th. Tome of the Councils, with some new Letters of *Hincmarus* about the same Business.

C H A P. VII.

The History of the Controversie upon the Eucharist debated in the Ninth Century.

THE Famous Controversie of Rome with the Lutherans and Calvinists, upon the Eucharist, has made Men more attentive to all Controversies formerly raised about that Mystery. The Ninth Century affords us one no less important than abstruse. It cannot be deny'd, that there were Great Contests in this Age about the Eucharist, occasioned by the Book of *Paschasius Radbertus*, Concerning the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; but the Difficulty is, to know the true State of the Question: And that's the thing which lies now upon me to clear, by giving a Faithful Account of the Authors that have written upon this Subject, as well as of their Writings. I shall begin therefore with *Paschasius Radbertus*, whose Book has occasioned the Debate upon this Subject.

Paschasius was a Native of *Soissons*, who, being from his Infancy forsaken by his Relations, was brought up by the Charity of the Nuns of our Lady of *Soissons*, in the out-parts of their Abby. He became afterwards a Monk in the Monastery of *Corbey*, then under the Government of *St. Adelardus*, Brother of *Theodrada* the Abbess of our Lady of *Soissons*, who had taken care of *Paschasius* in his Youth. He proved a very Studious Man, managed divers Conferences, and writ several Books. In short, having got a great name both by his Learning and Virtue, he was chosen Abbot of *Corbey*, Anno 844; but would not take upon him the Order of Priesthood, and contented himself with that of Deacon, which he had taken when he was a private Monk. Some Difference happened betwixt him and the Monks, which made him quit his Charge; and he spent the rest of his Life in reading and writing of Books. He died in the year 865.

His Treatise concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, was written when he was yet a Monk; and that during the Exile of his Abbot, to whom he gives in his Preface the name of *Arsenes*, and whom he calls another *Jeremy*. It has been a received Opinion, that it was *Adelardus*, who was Exiled Anno 814. But it is plain, by the Dialogue made by *Paschasius* upon the Life and Actions of *St. Adelardus*, that it was not *Adelardus*, but *Wala*, whom he called by the names of *Arsenes* and *Jeremy*. *Wala* was Exiled in the beginning of the Troubles raised by the Division that happened betwixt the Emperor *Lewis*, surnamed the Godly, and his Children, of which *Paschasius* himself takes notice in that Book, which made *Father Mabillon* conjecture, that this Book of *Paschasius* was not written till the Year 831; notwithstanding that, in a Manuscript of the Abby of *Corbey*, it is said, that this Abbot *Arsenes* is *Adelardus*, *Sanctus Adelardus*; which words seem to be foisted in, and are not to be found in other Manuscripts.

This Book Concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, bore likewise the Title of *A Treatise of the Sacrament*; for it is not true that *Paschasius* writ two Books with those two different Titles, but one Book with both Titles, as it appears by some Ancient Manuscripts. By other Manuscripts we find, that it was dedicated to an Abbot named *Placidus*, which is confirmed to us by the Testimonies of *Siebertus* and *Trithemius*. This *Placidus* was the Famous *Varinus*, Abbot of the New Abby of *Corbey* in *Saxony*, as it appears by a Letter of *Paschasius*, to be seen in the beginning of this Treatise, in the Manuscript of *Annecy*, published by *Father Mabillon*; who informs us besides, that this Book was composed for the Instruction of the Saxons, who were not as yet well instructed in the Christian Faith. In it, having first prepared their Minds to believe the Ineffable Mystery of the Eucharist, by demonstrating, that God by his Omnipotency may bring to pass many things Supernatural, and to us Incomprehensible, he says, that

[* No Man ought so doubt, &c.] Although in this sum of *Radbertus's* Book de Sacramento Corporis & Sanguinis J. C. there be many Expressions that manifest the Ancient Doctrine of the Spiritual Presence in the Sacrament only: yet it must not be deny'd, but that he speaks very plainly of the Substantial Conversion, and stands up stoutly for it; yet that this was a New Doctrine, and a strange Notion in the Church, appears by the General Opposition made to it by the Learned Men of the same Age, viz. *Rabanus*, *Scotus*, *Ber-*

cause under the Species, of a *tram*, &c. the sequel of the Controversie will manifest.] Visible Sign, God is pleased to work some secret Thing, or because the Holy Ghost does consecrate the Visible Sign, and under the Veil of Outward Signs does work some Mystical Thing for the Salvation of the Faithful. That all Sacraments in general may be defined to be an Earnest or a Pledge of Salvation, by which, under a Visible Representation, the Holy Ghost works in an invisible manner. That such are in the Church the Sacraments of Baptism, Chrism, and that of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ; therefore called Sacraments, because under the Visible Species the Flesh is consecrated by a Secret and Divine Vertue, so that they are in effect Inwardly, what they are thought to be Outwardly by Faith. That in Baptism we are regenerated by the Holy Ghost, and afterwards, by the Power of Jesus Christ, nourished with his Body and Blood; and that we ought not to wonder, that the Holy Ghost, who has formed our Saviour's Body in the Virgin's Womb, should, by an Invisible Power, change the Bread and Wine, though there appear no Visible Change, because it is done Spiritually and Invisibly. That by the Consecration of this Mystery, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are truly created, produced, and sacrificed in a Mystical Manner. That it is not to be deny'd, but that there is some Figure in this Mystery, being 'tis a Mystery, but that the Figure does not hinder the Reality. That what appears outwardly is a Figure, but the inward a Reality, because the Body and Blood of our Saviour are made of the Substance of the Bread and Wine: So that this Mystery is both a Figure and a Verity; a Figure of the hidden Truth, and a Verity, not perceivable indeed by the Senses, but believed by Faith. That the Ancient Figures differed vastly from this, they being but a Shadow and Image of what we really enjoy by Receiving this Mystery, the real Flesh and real Blood of Christ our Saviour. That those who do not dwell in Christ, that is, who remain in Sin, take the Sacramental Elements out of the Priest's hand, but do not eat and drink Spiritually the Body and Blood of Christ. That, in fine, the Church is the Body of Christ, that all the Faithful are Members of his Body, and that the Eucharist is daily consecrated to be the Body of Christ, but that those only, who are his Mystical Members are allowed to receive it. That from this Food some receive Life, others Death; it being Life to such as are Members of Jesus Christ, and Death to such as are Members of the Devil. That we must raise our Mind to God, and believe that after the words of Consecration, 'tis the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, that very Flesh which was born of the Virgin, and died upon the Cross. That Christ himself is upon the Altar, offering, as High-Priest, our Vows and Supplications to the Lord. That the Angels are present at this Sacrifice, in which our Saviour once sacrificed upon the Cross for the Salvation of Mankind, is daily offered in a Mystical Manner for the Attonement of the Sins we daily commit, to discriminate the Good from the Wicked, to dwell Corporally in such as have received Baptism, that they may dwell in him, and to nourish the Faithful: That therefore he is called *Bread*, because as the Bread nourishes the Body, so the Body of Jesus Christ nourishes the Souls of the Faithful: That he is also called *Wine*, because as the Wine is made of the Juice of several Grapes, so we are justify'd by the Graces and Spiritual Influences which flow from him, who is the true Vine, of which the Faithful are but Branches. That it is the very Blood which ran out of his Side at his Death and Passion; and that for that Reason it is, that we mingle Water with the Wine, because out of his Side there came both Blood and Water. That others say, Water is mingled with the Wine, to joyn together the Water of Baptism, and the Blood which was the Price of our Salvation. That, whether the Consecrating-Priest be a good or bad Man, we ought to believe, when we receive the Eucharist from his hands, that we equally receive the Truth of the Mystery; because the Consecration is not made by the Merit of him that consecrates, but by the Power of the Creator, and the Vertue of the Holy Ghost; and that it is Jesus Christ who baptizes, as it is he, by whom, through the Vertue of the Holy Ghost, the Eucharist becomes his Flesh and Blood. That the Priest is not the Creator of Christ's Body, but that he prays to God the Father by his Son; that he offers Gifts unto him, before the Consecration, and prays him to accept of them; and that he makes this Offering in the Name of the Church and of the Faithful. That, although this Sacrament has neither

Of the Controversie upon the Eucharist.

the Taste nor Colour of the Flesh and Blood, yet by the strength of Faith and Reason our Soul receives 'em as such; and that as we have received in Baptism the Image of our Saviour's Death, so we receive in this Sacrament the Likeness of his Flesh and Blood; so that there is Truth in this Mystery; and yet the Heathens cannot reproach us, that we drink the Blood, or eat the Flesh of a Dead Man.

That, to evidence these Truths, either to such as called them in question, or to those who had a tender love for

[† *The Body and Blood of our Saviour visibly appeared.*] This Fabulous Apparition *Hospinian de Sacr.* l. 4. p. 1 p. 325. tells us, is plainly foisted into the Original Manuscript, and doth so plainly differ from the Style and Doctrine of the rest of the Treatise, that it is easily discernable to a moderate Judgment, that the Chapters 38 and 39, wherein it is, are added by the Monk who put it out, or by some other, who would promote the Doctrine of Transubstantiation by such Legendary Tales.]

these Holy Mysteries, the † Body and Blood of our Saviour have sometimes visibly appeared upon the Altar, particularly to a Priest who had desired it ardently. That the Consecration of this Sacrament is made by the Energy of the words of Jesus Christ. That howsoever this Mystery be the Flesh and Blood of Christ, it may nevertheless be call'd Bread and Wine, by reason of the Effects they produce. For as the Terrestrial Bread is a support to our Temporal Life, so this Spiritual Bread yields unto us a Spiritual and Heavenly Life; and as Wine doth rejoyce the Heart of Man, so does this Heavenly Drink rejoyce the inward Man. That by receiving the Flesh of Christ we receive his Divinity, and that we receive both his Body and Blood, because they cannot be separated. That, though our Saviour did administer this Sacrament to his Apostles after Supper for some Mystical Reasons, it was nevertheless the Practice of the Catholick Church to receive it fasting. That it is not requisite however to forbear eating till the Eucharist be digested, according to the Injunctions of some Apocryphal Books. That, though this Sacrament nourishes our Bodies, we ought chiefly to consider the Spiritual Effects of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, as nourishing our Souls in a Spiritual Manner; so that it is frivolous to fear that this Sacrament goes into the draught as our Terrestrial Food, or that it mingles it self, and is digested with it. That we ought not to believe, that Christ is to drink Wine during his Reign of a Thousand years, as some have imagined. And lastly, that, though Good and Bad Men receive the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, yet we must believe, that this Sacrament is Salvation to the first, and Damnation to the last. Thus I have, in few words summed up *Paschasius's* Doctrine upon the Eucharist from his afore said * *Treatise*; to which he adds

several Considerations, with Allegorical and Mystical Reflections, and towards the Conclusion some Passages out of *St. Hilary, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Gregory, St. Leo, St. John Chrysostome, and Beda*, for the Confirmation of it.

A long time after this *Treatise* was published (for it was written in 831. before *Paschasius* was Abbot of Corbey, Rabanus, and what we are going to say happened but about the latter end of his Life, towards the Year 864.) *Fredegardus*, or *Fredegardus*, a Monk of the new Abby of Corbey, for whose Monks *Paschasius* had composed this Book, having met with some Men of a different Opinion, and himself entertaining some Doubts upon this Subject, did freely write unto him his thoughts upon the Matter. In Answer to which *Paschasius* writ him a † Letter, wherein he explained and confirmed what he had laid down in his *Treatise concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour*. There he says, that notwithstanding the Scruples of those Persons, he had good Reason to maintain, that it is the very Flesh of our Saviour which is given to us in the Eucharist, the same Flesh that was born of the Virgin, and the same Blood that was shed upon the Cross. Otherwise, says he, how can this Sacrament confer Eternal Life and the Remission of Sins, were it not the Flesh and Blood of him who is Life and Salvation? *Fredegardus* did own it to him, that he had been of that Opinion; but that having read in the third Book of the Christian Doctrine, writ by *St. Augustine*, that these words of our Saviour, *This is my Body, This is my Flesh*, are a Figurative Expression, and a Figure more than a Reality, he could not tell how to reconcile that with his former Sentiment. And the rather considering what that Holy Father seems to say, that it were a horrible thing to believe, that Christians eat the same Body which was born of the Virgin, and drink the same Blood that was shed upon the Cross. To which *Paschasius* answers, that it is not inconsistent with good Sense, to say, that those words of our Saviour are a Figurative Expression, because there is a Figure in this Mystery, and that the Real Body and Blood of Christ are really found in it, but in a Mystery and Figure, as our Saviour is called the Character and Figure of his Father, though he is really God. That he has sufficiently explained it in his Book, by asserting, that the Eucharist is both a Figure and a Real thing. That *St. Augustine* himself did own it, and that he agrees in that Point with *St. Ambrose, St. Cyprian, and Eusebius Emesenus*, some of whose Passages he quotes.

Whence he infers, that it is the Doctrine of the Fathers, though many doubt of it, who cannot apprehend how, the Bread remaining visibly entire, it can be said, that it is the Body and Blood of Christ. But that they would have other Thoughts of it, should they but consider, how five or six Loaves could be multiply'd into an infinite Number; and as those Loaves were multiply'd by the Power of God, so Christ's Flesh is multiply'd, and the abundance of his Flesh and Blood diffused in the Sacrament. That we say likewise, that Christ is daily sacrificed upon our Altars, though he died but once for the Salvation of Mankind, because we believe it to be done Spiritually, but not without the Sacrament: Which is not reiterated, by causing Christ to die again; but he is Mystically sacrificed every day for us, that we may receive in the Bread what was nailed to the Cross, and drink in the Cup what ran out of our Saviour's Side. For walking by Faith, our Belief ought to be Spiritual, not Carnal. Upon which he quotes a passage of *St. Gregory*, and another of the Council of *Ephesus*, and then invites *Fredegardus* to read over his *Treatise* attentively. Not, says he, that there is any thing extraordinary in it, being contrived for the meanest capacity; but because he heard that *Treatise* had stirred up many to apply themselves to the Knowledge of this Mystery, teaching them to entertain Notions worthy of our Saviour, whose Body is Incorruptible, because Spiritual, and that all things that are done in the Sacrament are also Spiritual: He tells him, that 'tis that Spirit who gives Life to those who receive it worthily; and that those who want Faith, or receive it unworthily, eat and drink their own Damnation. To his Letter he subjoyns an Abstract of his *Commentary* upon the 26th. Chapter of *St. Matthew's* Gospel, wherein he explains the Words of the Institution of the Eucharist, and opposes those who give them only a Figurative Sense, as if the Words imported nothing but the Figure and Virtue of the Body and Blood of our Saviour, and not his Real Flesh and Blood. Then he tells him, that he thought himself obliged to explain that passage more at large, upon the Information he had received, that some People found fault with what he had formerly written upon that Subject: Which Doctrine he confirms by the Testimonies of *St. Ambrose, St. Hilary*, and the Council of *Ephesus*, together with some Expressions in the Canon of the Mass.

Although *Paschasius* in his Book followed the Doctrine of the Church, it having been the Opinion of all the Orthodox before him, that the Body and Blood of Christ were actually present in the Eucharist, and that the Bread and Wine were changed into the Body and Blood of our Saviour. Yet it was not usual in those Times to say positively, that the Body of Christ in the Eucharist was the same that was born of the Virgin, and to assert it so plainly. This is the Judgment of Father *Maillon*, which he expresses in these words; *Quippe ante Paschasii Librum de Corpore & Sanguine Domini consitebantur Catholici omnes Christi Domini verum Corpus, verumque Sanguinem revera existere in Eucharistia; itemque Panem & Vinum in illa converti; at nemo of the Paschasii tempore illud Corpus esse idem quod ex Maria Virgine natum est tam directe asserere auditus fuerat.* These Expressions, says the same Author again, are indeed to be found in the Ancient Fathers; but this Age was either ignorant of those Passages, or did not take notice of them, *Id quidem antea ex Patribus tradiderant non pauci, sed ignota erant illo aeo, aut certe non observata eorum hac de re Testimonia.* *Paschasius* therefore, adds Father *Maillon*, teaching this Doctrine in his Book so positively, gave occasion for some eminent and learned Men to oppose his Opinion. These are his Words, *Quapropter cum Paschasius in Libro suo tam fidenter & asseveranter illud docuisset, hujus rei Novitate, ut sibi videbatur, commoti sunt quidam Viri docti haud incelebres, qui scriptis editis hanc ejus sententiam acriter impugnaverunt.* *Paschasius* maintained it by a Passage of *St. Ambrose*, in his Book of Mysteries; whence he concluded, that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was the very Flesh of our Saviour, born of the Virgin, crucified, and raised again from the Dead: Which Expression, being made publick, was disliked by *Rabanus, Ratramnus*, and an Anonymous Author in the time of *Paschasius*, then in the next following Age by *Erigerus*. They look'd upon *Paschasius* as one that receded from the express Words of *St. Augustine* and *St. Jerome*, who said, our Saviour's Body might be taken in two or three manners, and they could by no means approve of such Expressions. Their Controversie was * not about the real Presence, which they owned with *Paschasius*, but only about the Expression it self. *Paschasius* maintained, that not only the Body of our Saviour was really in the Eucharist, but also that Christians ought plainly to say, that there was no Difference betwixt the one and the other. His Adversaries

[* Not about the Real presence, but only about the Expression.] Although Transubstantiation be not plainly asserted in this Controversie, for it was not yet come so far as to determine how Christ's body was present in the Sacrament, whether *In* or *Trans*, or *Sub*, or *Con*; yet this Dispute laid the Foundation for it, though our Historian would persuade us 'twas but a verbal one only: Yet the Opposition on

Of the Controversie upon the Eucharist. of such learned men as appeared against Radbertus, do plainly intimate more, who would not fight with Shadows. These Expressions had a plain Tendency to a great Error: for though both Parties acknowledged a Real Presence, yet herein was the difference; Radbertus was for a carnal and bodily Presence, Bertram, Scotus, &c. were for a spiritual and figurative Presence; according as the Ancient Fathers had always held: which is not less real than the other. And if we keep in mind this Distinction, Radbertus and Bertram are as far from agreeing as Truth and Error.]

Blood of Christ. 'Tis true, Paschasius owned the Figure in the Eucharist, as they did the real Presence. But his Adversaries represented him as one that denied the Figure; and he thought his Adversaries disowned the real Presence, or at least that they had some Objections against it. Thus the whole Controversie betwixt them was merely about Expressions, and for want of a right Understanding.

The first Author that writ against Paschasius was a nameless Author, whose Writings upon this subject Father Mabillon found in a Manuscript of Gemblours, at the end of Erigerus's Treatise, with this Title, *Dicta cujusdam sapientis de corpore & sanguine Domini adversus Radbertum*. This Author says that, as all the Faithful ought to believe and confess that the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are one and the same Flesh, so they ought to believe that of the Bread is made his real Flesh, and of the Wine his real Blood, by the Consecration and Vertue of the Holy Ghost. Yet he opposes Paschasius's Expression; viz. *Quod non sit alia caro Christi quam quæ nata est de Maria, & passa in Cruce, & resurrexit de Sepulchro*; and says, that the Notion was perfectly new, he never read, or heard of it, and wonders St. Ambrose should make use of it. But he opposes St. Augustine to him, who says that our Saviour's Flesh is not eaten with our Teeth, such as it was upon the Cross, or as after it rose from the Dead. And, to reconcile St. Ambrose with St. Augustine, he says, that our Lord's Body in the Eucharist does not differ in Nature, but in Species, from his Body born of the Virgin; meaning (as he explains himself) that it is really the same, though in another state, and under another form, viz. under the Species of the Bread and Wine. So fully convinced was this Author, that Paschasius believed our Saviour's Flesh to be in the same manner, and as visibly in the Eucharist, as upon the Cross, that he charged him with this impious Assertion, that as often as Mass is celebrated, our Saviour suffers as really as he did upon the Cross. Father Mabillon affirms, that this anonymous Book is Rabanus's Letter to Egilo; but he brings no certain Proof for it. The Title is different, nor is the Treatise made in the form of a Letter; so that I am apt to think it another Thing. However, 'tis certain Rabanus has also found fault with Paschasius's Expressions: for, besides Erigerus's authority, who joyns him with Ratramnus, as one of Paschasius's Adversaries, Rabanus himself in his Letter to Heribaldus, speaks on that Subject in these Words; *Some Men, says he, not having true Sentiments upon the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, assert, that that very Body and Blood of our Saviour, which was born of the Virgin, and in which our Saviour suffered Death upon the Cross, is the same Body we receive at the Altar; which Opinion we have confuted, as much as in us lay, in our Letter to Egilo the Abbot, wherein we teach what ought to be believed concerning Christ's Body*. 'Tis true, these very Words, *Idem esse quod sumitur in Altari*, are not in the Manuscript; but Monsieur Baluzius has inserted them, upon the Credit of Erigerus. And, whatever Additions or Alterations might be made, 'tis plain, Rabanus did by no means approve of Paschasius's way of expressing himself; yet this is no Argument but that he believed Christ's real Presence in the Eucharist. For in the tenth Chapter of the seventh Book of Orders he expressly says, that *the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood*, and looks upon this Change as a very great Miracle. *Who could believe, says he, that the Bread could be changed into the Flesh of Christ, and the Wine into his Blood; if our Saviour himself had not said it, by whom both the Bread and Wine were created, and all things made of Nothing? 'Tis much more easie for him to make one thing of another, than to make all things of Nothing*. In his Book of the Institution of Clerks, he says, that *the visible Creatures being sanctified by the Holy Ghost, pass into the Sacrament of the Divine Body*. And in his Manuscript Commentary upon Joshua, he says, *That the Flesh and Blood of the unspotted Lamb are offered every day on the Altar, for the Nourishment of the Souls of the Faithful who receive the same, that the Shadow of the Law being past, the Truth of the Gospel may come to light*

by Jesus Christ himself. Whereby it appears that Rabanus did not in the least oppose the real Presence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, but only disproved Paschasius's Expression, which he thought seemed to intimate that the outward Signs of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which our Eyes see, and our Hands feel, are the very Body of our Saviour.

There is another Anonymous Author, whose Work is quoted by Erigerus, and inserted in the 12th. Tome of Dacherius's *Spicilegium*, who speaks to the same purpose. *As that bears there is nothing (says he) but what is true and real in Christ, the Name so there is nothing in the Mystery of his Body and Blood, of Blessing and the Word of God, that can be false or deceitful; and those Gifts being thus consecrated, are changed by an invisible Power into what they were not before, as the Water was changed into Wine at Cana, but that this being a spiritual Change, is not perceptible but by Faith*. Meaning, that the * Species of Bread and Wine remain, and that the inward Change, though real and effective, is not perceived by our bodily Eyes, but by Faith.

[*The Species remain, and the Inward Change, though real, is not perceived by our Eyes, but by Faith.]

Mr. Du Pin in representing this Controversie, uses the words, Species, Accidents and Form, to express the Elements of the Sacraments to us, that he may make the Romish Doctrines appear in the Venerable Robes of Antiquity, and so describes the Real Change, all along, as if it were Corporeal; but if we attentively observe the words of the Author, we shall find that Bertram, and those of his Sentiments, allowed no Material, but Sacramental Change in the Elements. Christ's Body and Blood were present Effectively and Really, but not Bodily and Substantially, or Transubstantially, as the Romanists hold; and in this Sense it is, that we Protestants, agreeably to all true Antiquity, as Casaubon says, *Credimus in Eucharistia presentiam, non minus quam ipsi Papicula veram*.]

But nothing gives us a clearer Insight into the State of the Question, then under debate, than the Book of the Body and Blood of our Lord, which passes commonly under the name of Bertram: But because some question whether he be the Author, it will not be improper, before we relate what is said therein to the present purpose, to examine whose Work it is, whether of Ratramnus himself, a Monk of Corbey, or of some other Author. The First Impression of this Book was at Cologne, Anno 1533, by the Care of the Protestants of Germany; which made it the more odious to many Catholics, who, without a due examination thereof, look'd upon it as a Book that countenanced the Error of the Protestants in the point of the Eucharist. Some there were, as amongst others, Sixtus Senensis, and Despresians Santonensis, who gave it out for spurious: But, some Ancient Manuscripts of it being found, that supposition ceased. Some undertook the Defence of this Treatise, others conceived there were many things in it fit to be corrected, and others gave it quite over. But, however Divines were divided in those days, upon the Doctrine of this Book, still they agreed in this, that Bertramus and Ratramnus were the same, though Bertramus is the most commonly used, and to be seen both in Sigebertus and Trithemius. Archbishop Usher is the first that quoted him under the name of Ratramnus, taking it for an undoubted Truth, that Bertramus and Ratramnus were the same. But Maresius being asked his Opinion concerning this Author, by Father Dacherius, writ to him a Learned Epistle, inserted into the Second Tome of his *Spicilegium*, that came out in 1657, in which he maintains, That the Book bearing the name of Bertramus, is not Ratramnus's; but that it is the Book of Johannes Scotus Erigena, who did certainly write a Treatise on the same Subject, in which he seemed to oppose the Reality of our Saviour's Body in the Eucharist. This Opinion was followed by Father Paris, a Canon Regular of St. Genovefa, eminent both for his Learning and Piety, in the Discourse he made upon this Subject, and which he put at the end of the First Tome of his Book, called, *The Perpetual Tenour of our Faith*: and of late by Father Harduin, in his Treatise of *The Sacrament of the Altar*. The Principal Reasons on which they ground their Conjectures are these. 1. What Authors have said of the Book of Johannes Scotus, concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, does agree with the Book that bears the name of Bertramus. Affelin tells us, That it was a little Book, wherein he endeavoured to prove, that what is consecrated upon the Altar, is not really the Body and Blood of Christ; for a Proof whereof, he alledged several places of Scripture, which he explained contrary to the true meaning of them, and quoted, amongst other things, St. Gregory's Prayer in these words, *Persicant in nobis tua, Domine, Sacramenta*, &c. to which he added next, *Specie geruntur ista, non Veritate*. All which agrees with Bertramus's small Book, wherein the Author seems to design to disprove the Reality of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. In order to which he alledges several Passages taken out of the Fathers, and, amongst others, that very Prayer of St. Gregory, with this

Gloss, *Dicit quod in Specie geruntur ista, non Veritate.* Berengarius, speaking of Scotus's Book, tells us, That it was written by the Order of Carolus Magnus; and Bertramus's Book is thus dedicated, *Ad Carolum Magnum.* 'Tis own'd, that Charles the Great is the same with Charles the Bald: But, since the Title of Great was not commonly given to this last, 'tis unlikely (some think) that two Authors should have dedicated it to him: So that Bertramus's Book must be the same mention'd by Berengarius. 2. 'Tis alledged, That the Book of Johannes Scotus, and that of Bertramus never appear'd together; and that the Authors who quoted the one, never quoted the other. 3. 'Tis affirm'd, that the Style, Genius, and Character of Bertramus's Book, are the same with that of Scotus; that there is the same Spirit of Confusion and Contradiction which appears in his other Works, and the same Disagreement from the Doctrines generally received in the Church. The Arguments are in due form. The Conclusion of Bertramus's Book is very like unto the Preface of Scotus's Book of Predestination; and the Conclusion of his Fifth Book of the Division of Nature. These are the Conjectures of Learned Authors, which indeed seem very strong, and might have made their Opinion very probable, had not the Learned Father Mabillon brought positive Proofs to the contrary, such as are not grounded upon meer Conjectures, but upon Matter of fact: Who, in the first place, insists upon the authority of a Manuscript of the Abby of Lobbes, written above 500 years since; wherein is found the Book of the Body and Blood of our Saviour; and, next to that the two Books of Ratramnus, touching Predestination. One bearing this Title, *Incipit Liber Ratramni de Corpore & Sanguine Domini; Jussisti, gloriose Princeps.* The other this, *Incipit Liber de Prædestinatione Dei, Domino glorioso atque præcellentissimo Regi Carolo, Ratramnus:* Which Inscriptions are confirmed by an Ancient Catalogue of Books of that Library made in 1049, with these words in it, *Ratramni de Corpore & Sanguine Domini Liber I. Ejusdem de Prædestinatione Dei ad eundem Libri II.* It is an unquestionable Evidence, that the Book bearing the name of Bertramus is really his; that this Manuscript which is of the same Century, bears his name in the Title, and his Books of Predestination are joyned unto that of the Body and Blood of our Saviour, which proves it to come from the same Author. The same Father does assure us besides in his Travels into Germany, that he saw another Manuscript of above 700 years standing, with the very same Supercriptions.

Secondly, 'Tis worth our Observation, that the Anonymous Author of Father Cellot doth attribute to Ratramnus Abbot of Corbey, and to the Author of the two Books concerning Predestination, That of the Body and Blood of our Saviour, under the name of Bertramus. And, if that Anonymous Author was Contemporary, his Testimony in this Case must needs be decisive. Now that Author was Erigerus, Abbot of Lobbes, who succeeded Fulcin in that Dignity, Anno 890, and died in 907, as Father Mabillon proves by an Ancient Manuscript; wherein the Anonymous Book, published by Father Cellot, bears the name of Erigerus. And it appears besides by the Chronicle of Lobbes, that that Abbot had written upon that Subject. This is observable moreover, that the said Author, speaking of Ratramnus's Book concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, says, That it was divided into a hundred Chapters, the same Division that is found in the foresaid Ancient Manuscript of Lobbes: Which makes it a strong Presumption, that it was the very same Manuscript which Erigerus had.

Thirdly, In two Ancient Manuscripts of Siebert, instead of Bertramus, we read Ratramus, or Ratramnus. In Trithemius he is called Betramnus, or Ratramnus: Which names do not differ much from that of Ratramnus, afterwards smoothed into Bertramus. But that which is the most decisive in this case, is, what those Authors do say, viz. That the Author of the Book touching the Body and Blood of our Saviour, did also write a Book concerning Predestination, dedicated to Charles the Bald. *Scripsit, says Siebert, Librum de Corpore & Sanguine Domini, & ad Carolum Librum de Prædestinatione.* Trithemius makes him Author of several Works, of all which he found (as he says) but one Book *De Corpore & Sanguine Domini*; and another, *Ad Carolum de Prædestinatione.* Now the Book of Predestination, written by Johannes Scotus, was not dedicated to Charles, but to Hincmarus and Pardulus; whereas Ratramnus's Book was dedicated to that Emperor. We must therefore conclude Ratramnus to be the Author of the Book concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour.

These positive Proofs are sufficient to destroy all opposite Conjectures, which, how plausible soever they may appear, are not altogether solid. For why might not both Ratramnus and Scotus write a Book upon the Eucharist, as they did upon Predestination; And what should hinder both their Works to be much of the same length? They might be each of them confuted by the Emperor Charles

the Bald about the Eucharist, as they were about Predestination. Why could they not both be of the same Opinion, as Ratramnus and Gottschalkus chanced to be of the same Controversy. Judgment about this Expression *Trina Deitas*? 'Tis not to be wondered at, that both of 'em should have made Collections of Passages out of the Fathers, seeing it was the common Practice in their Time, and the usual way of those two Authors. Why is it urged, that they have not both alledged St. Gregory's Prayer, *Perficiant tua, Domine, &c.* being it was a common Testimony? The Gloss of Ratramnus, upon that Prayer, differs from that of Scotus, who, according to Affelin, had written, *Specie geruntur ista, non Veritate.* Ratramnus does not say so; but explaining the words of the Prayer, *Dicit (says he) quod in Specie geruntur ista, non Veritate, id est per Similitudinem, non per ipsius rei Manifestationem:* Which words, *Specie geruntur ista, non Veritate,* were the Comment Scotus made upon it; whereas here the Words of the Prayer are explained by the next Words, not in the least disagreeable to the Catholic Faith. As to the Dedication, Why might it not happen that two Authors should be of the same Mind, in giving the Title of Great to Charles the Bald? Besides, that in the Manuscript of Ratramnus's Book in the Abby of Lobbes, there is no such thing to be found as *Præfatio ad Carolum Magnum Imperatorem.* And, when this Book was composed, Charles was not yet Emperor: So that the Title must needs be added afterwards. But there are other Instances of this Epithet of Great, given to Charles the Bald. The second Reason grounded upon a Pretence, That they who were acquainted with Scotus's Book, knew nothing of Bertramus's, is confuted by what has been already alledged, that in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries Ratramnus's Book was transcribed under his name, and quoted by Erigerus, that of Scotus by Aldrevadus. In the Eleventh, the Book of Ratramnus was transcribed by Siebert, and Scotus's Book by those who writ against Berengarius. To conclude, the last Reason is a groundless Error. So far is it from being true, that Bertramus's Book is of the same Style and Character with those of Scotus, that on the contrary it is most uniform both in Style and other Circumstances with Ratramnus's other Works, whereof any Reader may be a competent Judge. Thus much as to what concerns the Author of the Book, that bears the name of Bertramus. Let us now proceed to the Subject Matter of it.

The Question, upon which Charles the Bald asked his Opinion, is thus stated by him. *While (says he) amongst the Faithful, some say there is no Veil or Figure in the Mystery of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which is daily celebrated in the Church, but that it is done by a plain Manifestation of naked Verity, and others on the contrary maintain, that the Body and Blood of our Saviour are contained therein under the Figure of the Mystery, and that what appears to our bodily Senses differs from what our Faith perceives in it; the Church is divided by these different Opinions, and a way made to a kind of Schism.* So that here is the true State of the Question, *Whether or no there is any Figure in the Eucharist, if it be without any Veil, and whether the Body, its self and Blood of our Saviour be perceived by our outward Senses.* Your Majesty, says he, desires to be satisfy'd, whether the Body and Blood of Christ be made in a Mystery or in Truth; that is to say, whether it is so made, as that there is something secret and hidden, not to be perceived but by the eyes of Faith; or whether our outward eyes do outwardly perceive what the inward sight does perceive inwardly in it, without any Veil of the Mystery, in such a manner, that the whole of it does manifestly and openly appear. Those are the words of the first Question. So that the Question is not, Whether the Body and Blood of Christ be in the Eucharist, that being taken for granted; but whether they be there without Veil, so as to appear to our outward Eyes. For 'tis in this Sense the Author takes the Word Verity, and opposes it to Figure. 'Tis a naked Verity, without Veil or Mystery, such as is perceived by our outward Senses, and doth exclude all manner of Figure.

The other Question proposed to Ratramnus, is *Whether that very same Body we receive be that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffer'd, and was put to Death, which was buried, and rose again from the Dead, then ascended into Heaven, and now sits on the Right Hand of the Father Everlasting:* That is to say, Whether his Body be in the same manner in the Eucharist, as it was and is in those Places, and whether it be there in as visible and palpable a manner. For, to prove that it is not so, he says, *That the Body of our Saviour, in its natural state, is under the form of a humane Body, with Bones and Sinews, and all the Lineaments of a Man's Limbs;* Whereas in the Eucharist 'tis under another Form, not supported by Bones and Sinews, nor with that Distinction of Limbs, in such a state as makes it incapable of proper Motions, or to give any sign of Life.

To those two Questions Ratramnus answers distinctly, in the two Parts of his Book. But, that his Opinion of the State of the Question may be the better understood, he gives first the Definitions of what he calls a Figure and a Verity.

The Opinion of the Author of the Book that bears Bertramus's Name.

Verity. A Figure, says he, is when there is some Obscurity, and that under some certain Veils another Thing is exhibited. A Verity, on the contrary, is a manifest Demonstration of the Thing, without the Covering of any Image or Figure. This being granted, he maintains, That if the Mystery of the Body and Blood of our Saviour were made without any Figure, it could not properly be called a Mystery, because that cannot be called a Mystery, wherein there is nothing hidden; nothing but what is perceived by our outward Senses; nothing cover'd with any Veil. That that Bread which is made the Body of Christ, by the Ministry of the Priest, shews outwardly one Thing to the Senses, and, at the same Time, insinuates into the Minds of the Faithful, that there is another Thing inwardly. Outwardly it appears to be Bread, as it was before; we perceive its Form, the Colour, and Taste; but we believe, that inwardly it is something much more precious and excellent, because it is a divine and heavenly Thing, that is to say, the Body of our Saviour which is exhibited therein, which does not fall under our outward Senses, but is by the Eyes of our Souls seen, received and eaten. The same he says of the Wine, and our Saviour's Blood; and concludes, that the Bread and Wine are, by a Figure, the Body of Christ; that is to say, That we do not see any Flesh and Blood, but Bread and Wine, though after the Mystical Consecration it is no more called Bread and Wine, but the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. To which he adds, that, If there were no Figure, as some maintain'd, and that the whole Truth might be plainly seen, there would be no Room for Faith, and then 'twould be no Mystery, because it hath nothing in it that is secret.

Next he shews, That the Change which is made in the Eucharist is not made visibly, and to our outward Senses. For, says he, 'tis not a Change of a Thing that was not, into one that is; Seeing the Bread and Wine were, before they were changed into the Body and Blood of our Saviour. Nor is it a Change of a Thing that is, into one that is not, seeing the Form of the Bread and Wine appears the same to our Eyes. Nor lastly, the Change of one Thing into another by a Change of Qualities, the Qualities of the Bread and Wine remaining still the same. Whence he concludes, That those who believe no Figure in the Eucharist cannot explain that Change, and must own that there is nothing in it, which was not before. Nevertheless, says he, 'tis something else, for the Bread and Wine are made the Body and Blood of our Saviour. And here he charges his Adversaries home, asserting, they must either own, that the Change which is made in the Eucharist is not an outward Change; or, deny, That it is the Body and Blood of our Saviour, *Quod nefas est non solum dicere, sed etiam cogitare*, the very Thought of which is criminal. But they granting, says he, That the Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament, which cannot be without a Change for the better, and that Change cannot be made corporally, into that which falls under our outward Senses, but spiritually; it necessarily follows, that it must be made in a Figure, because under the Veil of the Corporeal Bread and Wine, the Spiritual Body and Blood of our Saviour are really present, and do conjunctly exist. But we must not therefore imagine, that they be two Existences of two different Things, viz. Body and Spirit. For, on the contrary, 'tis but one and the same Thing, which, in one Respect, is the Species of the Bread and Wine; and, in another Respect, is the Body and Blood of our Saviour. Now this Bread and Wine, as they fall under our outward Senses, are Species of Corporal Creatures. But, if consider'd in Relation to the Power which has raised them into a Kind of Spiritual Being, they are the Mysteries of the Body and Blood of our Saviour. By their outward Superficies falling under our Senses, they are Creatures subject to Change and Corruption; but, if we look upon 'em with Relation to the Strength, and Effect of the Mystery, they confer Life and Immortality on those who receive them.

This he explains by the Simile's of Baptism and the Manna, which indeed are not altogether parallel, but such as may be, in some Sense, apply'd to it. For, as in Baptism, there is an outward Sign that falls under our Senses, and an inward Grace apprehended by Faith, so there are in the Eucharist the Species of Bread and Wine that fall under our Senses, and the invisible Body of our Saviour. And as the inward Grace and Vertue of Baptism for the healing of our Souls is also real and true, so the Body of our Saviour Christ is really and truly present under the Species. As to the Manna, this Author seems to be singular in his Opinion about its Conversion into the Body and Blood of our Saviour, which he affirms in very ardent Terms; but he was forced to do it, the better to adapt his Simile to the Subject in hand; which is a further Proof that he owned a real Change in the Eucharist. Next to that he quotes that Place of Scripture out of St. John's Gospel, Chap. 6. *If you do not eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood.* Upon which he makes this Observation, That our Saviour does not say, That, to eat his Flesh, it must be cut in Pieces, such as it was crucified, or that his Blood must be drunk in the same Manner as it was shed upon the Cross; but

that the Faithful shall truly receive by this Mystery the Bread and Wine converted into the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. Thus is clearly explained the Reality of the Body of Christ, and the Change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of our Saviour. Afterwards he quotes several Passages out of St. Augustine and St. Isidorus, upon which he observes, 'That the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, not in a visible, but in an invisible Manner, by the Operation of the Holy Ghost; and that they are therefore called the Body and Blood of Christ, because they are not look'd upon by their outward Appearance, but as they are made by the Divine Spirit; and that by an invisible Power they become quite another Thing than they appear to our Eyes. That Part of the Eucharist, which is outward and visible, feeds our Bodies, whilst the inward and invisible feeds and gives Life to our Souls.

Lastly, He concludes this first Part in these Words; 'By what hath been said hitherto it plainly appears, That the Body and Blood of our Saviour received in the Church by the Mouth of the Faithful, are Figures, if consider'd by the visible and outward Form of the Bread and Wine: But, if consider'd by their Substance, hidden to our Eyes, that is, by the Power of the Divine Word, they are indeed the Body and Blood of Christ. Therefore, according to the visible Creature, they are a Food for our Bodies; but, by the Power of a mightier Substance, they nourish and sanctify the Souls of the Faithful.

After this, he comes to the second Question, which he expresses in these Words; *Whether the same Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered, and was buried, and sits on the Right-hand of the Eternal Father, be the same which the Faithful daily receive in the Church by the Mystery of the Sacrament.* The first Author he quotes upon this Question is St. Ambrose, a Passage out of whose first Book, *De Sacramentis*, he sets down; and out of it he draws this Conclusion; That what we receive corporally, that is, what we touch with our Teeth, swallow down, and goes into the Belly, is not the Thing that feeds our Souls; but that it is the living Bread, the Body of Christ, which is perceptible only to our Faith: Which shews, that this Question agrees to the former, and that it does not lie in this, to know, Whether the Body and Blood of our Saviour be received in the Eucharist; but how it is received, and in what Manner it is there, whether without any Figure or Veil, and whether it be that very Thing we feel, or break, &c. And here he repeats his Argument drawn from the Change, which must be inward and invisible, seeing it is not outward and apparent. Thus continuing to alledge Passages out of St. Ambrose, he starts this Objection; *Those, says he, who are not of my Opinion, do object and say, That what we see is the very Body of our Saviour; and that which we drink is his Blood; and that we ought not to enquire how it comes to pass, but that 'tis our Duty to believe it to be so.* To which he makes this Answer, *That this Opinion is reasonable, and that we ought firmly to believe, that it is the Body and Blood of Christ; but that therefore we believe it, because we do not see it; for, could we see it, we should not say I believe, but I see it; that it is not the Eye of the Body but Faith that perceives it; and that what is seen is not in Specie, but in Operation and Effect, the Body and Blood of Christ; that is to say, That the Body of Christ does not appear in it under a Humane Shape.* Therefore, adds he, St. Ambrose says, *That we ought not to mind the Course of Nature, but the Power of Christ, who changes what seemeth good unto him, and in what Manner he pleases, who created those Things which were not, and changes what he has created into what it was not before.* To be virtually the Body of Christ, according to our Author, is to be so really, but not visibly, because under another Form or Appearance. For, as he says afterwards, 'tis Bread in Specie; but, in the Sacrament, the real Body of Christ: *In Specie Panis est, in Sacramento verum Christi Corpus.* 'Tis the Body and Blood of Christ, but not in a corporal Manner. *Corpus Christi, sed non corporaliter; Sanguis Christi, sed non corporaliter.*

The Difference he makes betwixt the Body of Christ in which he suffered, and that in the Eucharist is, 'That the first was had under no Form, but its own. It was what it appeared to be to the Eyes and to the Feeling; what the Jews saw upon the Cross, and afterwards in the Grave. His Blood, in the like Manner, was visible, not cover'd with any Veil. Whereas his Blood which the Faithful drink, and his Body which they eat, are quite another Kind of Thing, both in the Sign and the Thing signify'd. The corporal Flesh that was born of the Virgin, and crucify'd, consisted of Bones and Sinews, had Limbs and Parts distinct from each other; shewed Signs of Life, and had proper Motions. But the Spiritual Flesh wherewith the Faithful are fed spiritually, according to the outward Form, consists of Grains of Wheat, and is made by a Baker's Hands, no Part of it distinct from another. It does not appear living, nor animated, is not endued with any proper and natural Motion, and its Vertue of conferring Life is the Effect of a Spiritual Power, of the invisible

and efficacious Power of God. What it appears outwardly to be is quite another Thing from what it is thought to be inwardly. To which he adds, That the Bread of the Eucharist is not only a Figure of our Saviour's Body, but observes by the Bye, that it is also a Figure of the Body of the Faithful, and that the Water mingled with the Wine does likewise represent it in a Spiritual Manner. In fine, to demonstrate it further, that the Species of Bread and Wine are not the Body of our Saviour, he says, That his Body in Heaven is incorruptible, eternal, indivisible; but that the Sacrament is corruptible, and divisible, in its outward and sensible Parts, though incorruptible in that Part of it which is perceptible to Faith. From whence he draws this Conclusion, *Therefore what appears outwardly is not the Thing it self, but the Image of it, and what the Soul perceives and apprehends in it is the Truth of the Thing.*

All which he proves by several Passages of St. *Austine*, by the Prayers of the Mass, and other Passages, from which he does still infer, That the Body of Christ in the Eucharist differs from that which was born of the Virgin, that suffered, and rose again from the Dead, yet not in Substance, but in Appearance. Lastly, directing his Speech to the Emperor, he declares, That he has clearly proved by Places of Scripture, and by the Fathers Writings, that the Bread and Wine which are called the Body and Blood of our Saviour are a Figure, because a Mystery; also, that there's a Difference betwixt the Body of Christ in that Mystery, and that which suffer'd Death and was buried. That here it is invisible, not being perceiv'd but by Faith; whereas being unveil'd upon the Cross, it was known, and fully discover'd by the outward Senses. That the Mystery of the Eucharist is likewise a Figure of the Elect People of God. And lastly, that the Bread and Wine called, and being in Effect the Body and Blood of our Saviour, do represent our Lord's Death and Passion. That from some Expressions of his one ought not to infer, That the Faithful do not receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Mystery of the Sacrament, because Faith does not receive what the Eye perceives, but what is believed by Faith, and that it is a spiritual Meat and Drink which feeds our Souls in a Spiritual Manner, and yields unto them a Spiritual Life, according to our Saviour's saying, *'Tis the Spirit that quickens, the Flesh profiteth nothing.*

Joannes Scotus, as well as *Ratramnus*, was likewise consulted upon the same Question by *Charles the Bald*, and writ a Book on the same Subject; in which he argued against the same Expressions opposed by *Ratramnus*. But 'tis apparent he went farther than he, delivering such Things as were contrary to the Doctrine of the Church upon the real Presence: Which *Hincmarus* charges him with in the 31st. Chapter of his Treatise of Predestination; wherein speaking of him and *Prudentius*, he says, That they set on Foot new Tenents, contrary to the Faith of the Church; and amongst others, That the Sacraments of the Altar are not the real Body and Blood of our Saviour, but only a Commemoration of his Body and Blood. But this cannot be justly attributed to *Prudentius*, who never was look'd upon to be guilty of any Error in this Point; but only to *Scotus*, whose Book was afterwards quoted by *Berengarius*, and condemned by the Orthodox. *Hincmarus* wrote this in 859. which shews, that the Consultation of *Charles* about the Eucharist happened before that Year, and serves to fix the Epocha of *Ratramnus* and *Scotus*'s Book upon this Subject.

Amongst the Authors of the same Century that have but cursorily treated of this Matter, *Amalarius*, *Florus*, and *Druthmarus* speak of it like *Ratramnus*. But *Haimo* Bishop of Halberstadt, and *Remigius* Monks of Auxerre follow *Paschasius*'s way of speaking, and even go beyond his Bounds, denying, after St. *John Damascene*, that the Eucharist may be called a Figure of the Body and Blood of our Saviour.

About the latter End of this Century, *Erigerus* Abbot of Lobbes wrote against the same Proposition which *Ratramnus* had attempted to overthrow; but still maintaining the real Presence in the Eucharist. *Sigebert* and the Author who continued the Chronicle of Lobbes, speaking of him, observe, That he had collected many Passages out of the Orthodox Fathers against *Paschasius* Radbertus, touching the Body and Blood of our Saviour. Yet 'tis certain, that *Erigerus* is so far from contending directly with *Paschasius*, that he doth in Effect excuse him, and defend his Cause by the Authority of several Fathers, declaring, That he only failed in this, that he did not quote Word for Word the Passage of St. *Ambrose*, but gave the Sense only. He charges him not with Error, but with Simplicity; and observes, that he did not deny but that there was a Figure in the Eucharist. It appears however, that he favours the Opinion of *Ratramnus* and *Rabanus*, and that he does not approve of *Paschasius*'s Expression, viz. That it is the same Flesh which was born of the Virgin that is in the Eucharist, being persuaded, that though it is the same, yet it ought to be consider'd as different, because 'tis in a different State. And for this Reason it is that he makes a Collection of Passages out of the Fathers against *Paschasius*, wherein Mention is made of two or three Bodies of Christ, by reason of the different States

of his Body. The same Expressions are moreover to be found in the Sermons of *Alfricus* Archbishop of Canterbury, who seems to have copied *Ratramnus*.

This Way of explaining the Mystery of the Eucharist was so far from being condemn'd in the Time of *Berengarius*, even by his Adversaries, that *Lanfrank* makes use of it in the Dialogue he made against him. Wherein he owns, that one may say of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, that it is the same which was born of the Virgin, and yet not the same; that it is the same, as to the Substance, Property, and Vertue of its true Nature; and not the same, if we consider the Species of Bread and Wine. After the same Manner *Algerus* does reconcile the Fathers, who seem to differ in their Opinions on this Matter. The Holy Fathers, says he, have observed this Duplicity, not of Substance, but of Form, when speaking of the Body of our Lord in the Eucharist, they say, that it was the same which was born of the Virgin, and in some Sense not the same; the same in Substance, and not the same in Form. *Falbertus* Bishop of Chartres makes the same Distinction in his Epistle to *Einardus*.

But we ought to observe, that *Paschasius*'s Mode of Expression was not new, as his Adversaries affirmed. Witness * many of the Ancient Fathers, who speak in the same Manner: As amongst the Greeks, St. *Ignatius*, *Athanasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Cyril* of Jerusalem, *Cyril* of Alexandria, the Fathers of the Council of Ephesus, *Anastasius Sinaïta*, St. *Gregory of Nice*, St. *John Damascene*; and amongst the Latins, St. *Hilary*, St. *Ambrose*, and St. *Austine*

[* Many of the Ancient Fathers speak as *Paschasius*.] It is confessed, that many of the Ancients did use many Hyperbolic Expressions about the Sacrament, much like *Paschasius*'s, but it was to stir up Reverence to their Holy Mysteries, and convince Men that the Elements were not mere Bread and Wine, not dogmatically to assert a Carnal Presence; for in their Doctrinal Discourses about it, they speak only of a Spiritual and Figurative Presence.]

himself in his Discourse to the *Neophytes*; besides many others, who deliver Propositions equivalent to that of *Paschasius*. So that *Paschasius* cannot justly be charged with Innovation, either in the Thing it self, or the Way of expressing it. And his Adversaries seem to have fall'n upon him undeservedly, the more because he rejected the Conclusions they drew from his Expression, and owned that the Eucharist was both Figure and Reality, and that it contained the Body of Christ under the Veil and Species of the Bread and Wine.

Another famous Question about the Eucharist was started in this Age, viz. Whether any Part of the Eucharist be evacuated, as our other Food? They who stood for the Affirmative being called by the odious Name of *Stercoranists*. To understand clearly the State of this Question, we must remember the Eucharist consists of two Things, one inward and hidden, the other outward and sensible. The first is the Body and Blood of our Saviour, which are present in the Sacrament after an invisible Manner; and the other consists of the Species of Bread and Wine, which appear to our outward Senses. None ever did believe that the invisible Body and Blood of Christ were subject to the same Conditions with our other Nourishment, or produced the same Effects. But because the Species of Bread and Wine under which 'tis contained feed our Bodies, we say without any Scruple, that the Body and Blood of Christ are converted into our Substance, and feed our Body. This Expression was ever used in the Church. And some Fathers have proved the Resurrection of our Bodies, Because it is not so be thought, says St. *Irenaeus*, that our Flesh being fed with the Body and Blood of our Saviour, should remain for ever in a State of Corruption.

But if the Body of Christ has a nourishing Property, 'tis not the Body it self by its own proper Substance; but it is by the outward Signs, the Bread and Wine, which nourish us by the Matter which God hath made as it were a Vehicle to us of the Body and Blood of Christ which in our Faith and Minds took up before the Place of the material Bread and Wine. But notwithstanding that the Church has made no Scruple to say, that the Body and Blood of our Saviour are converted into our Substance, and nourish us by the Species of Bread and Wine, it was ever thought indecent even to think, much more to assert, that it was liable to the same Evacuation as our common Food, and that any Part of it should go into the Draught. The first that seems to have took Notice of this Question is *Origen*, whose Decision of it is in these Words, that this Food consecrated by Prayers and the Word of God, goes down into the Belly, and so into the Draught, as to the Matter it does consist of, meaning the Species of Bread and Wine, not as to what it is made by Prayer. The Author of the Sermon of the Eucharist, which is in the fifth Volume of the Greek and Latin Works of St. *Chrysostome*, seems to differ in his Opinion. Is that Bread, says he, which you see with your outward Eyes? Is that Wine? Has that Food the same Fate as other Sorts of Food? God forbid, and let none of you have such Thoughts of it. This Author seems to affirm, That the Body of our Lord is the very Species that we see; and does formally deny

Expressions of other Authors of this Age upon the Eucharist.

The Question of Stercoranism.

deny it to be liable to the same Condition with our common Food. St. John Damascene embraces this Opinion in the 14th. Chapter of the 4th. Book of the Orthodox Faith; adding however, that the outward Species of the Eucharist is converted into our Substance. Paschasius is of the same Opinion, and says 'tis a Weakness to think that any Part of this Myſtery is under the Laws with other Food. *Frivolum est ergo*, says he Chap. 20. *sicut in Apocrypho Libro legitur, in hoc Myſterio cogitare de Stercore, ne commisceatur in alterius cibi digestionem*. And he asserts, That all passes into our Flesh and Substance, without any Evacuation. Ratramnus indeed does own, that the Spiritual Body of our Saviour is not under the same Condition with other Food, and will not so much as have it said that it feeds our Bodies, seeing it is Food for our Souls. But he affirms, according to his Principles, That the visible and outward Species are under the same Laws with all other Food. This is all that is said by those Authors upon that Question.

But Amalarinus treats of it on purpose in his Letter to Gontardus a Monk, who took Exception at his spitting presently after his receiving the Eucharist, supposing he might then spit out some Part of our Saviour's Body, the Fear of which kept other Priests from spitting at such a Time. To which Amalarinus answers, That being a phlegmatick Man, he could not long forbear spitting, and that he hoped, that for his Infirmary sake God will not deprive him of the Body of Christ his Saviour as the Nourishment of his Soul, if it be but pure and humble before him, and that what he must needs eject for the Health of his Body, will be no Prejudice to his Soul. These are his Words, *Et quod exendum est propter Sanitatem Corporis, faciat exire sine dispendio Animæ*. To justify himself more at large, he thoroughly handles the Question, and makes this Observation, That the Body of Christ is upon Earth as often as he pleases; that nothing but an ill Disposition of the Mind can make the Body incapable of receiving it; so that tho' any Part of Christ's Body should come out of his Mouth, unknown to him, one ought not therefore to think him irreligious, or that he despised the Body of our Saviour, nor think that his Body went to any Place where God would not have it; that our Saviour's Body quickens our Souls; or rather, is the Life of our Souls; and therefore we do not take its Life away, tho' we part with it. To conclude, he says, 'Tis needless to enquire, whether our Saviour's Body, after it is received with an upright Intention, be invisibly raised up into Heaven, or kept in our Body till its Burial; whether it be exhaled into the Air, or issues out of the Body with the Blood, or through the Pores, the Lord saying, that whatever comes into the Mouth goes down into the Belly, and from thence into the Draught; but the chief Thing that we ought to mind is, that we do not receive it Judas-like, with a treacherous Heart, that we do not slight it, but distinguish it (as we ought) from common Food.' Thus Amalarinus propounds the Question, without deciding it, and does not declare his Opinion in the Matter.

Heribaldus Bishop of Auxerre having propounded the same Question to Rabanus Archbishop of Mentz, the Archbishop returned him this Answer; 'As to your Question concerning the Eucharist, Whether being consumed and voided out of the Body as other Sorts of Food are, it re-assumes the Nature it had before its Consecration upon the Altar? This Question, says he, seems to me superfluous, because our Saviour himself says in the Gospel, That whatever comes into the Mouth goes down into the Belly, and from thence into the Draught. The Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour is made of Things visible and corporeal; but it works Sanctification and the invisible Salvation both of the Body and Soul. There is no Ground to think, that what is digested in the Stomach should return into its former State, a Thing avouched by no Man as yet.' Here Rabanus supposes, that the Species of Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, are under the same Laws and Contingencies with our common Food, and that they do not re-assume their proper Nature which they had before the Consecration. For it is plain, that he does not speak of our Saviour's Body, but of the outward Species of Bread and Wine.

Some Authors that were more scrupulous, fancied this Opinion unsuitable to the Dignity of the Myſtery, and that it was more decent to think, either that the Species are annihilated, or that they have a perpetual Being, or else are changed into Flesh and Blood, and not into Humours or Excrements to be voided. 'Tis the Opinion of an Anonymous Author, quoted by Erigerus under the Character of a certain learned Man, whose Work is inserted in the second Volume of Dacherius's *Spicilegium*. 'This Author distinguishes two Things in the Eucharist, viz. the invisible Body of our Saviour, which is Spiritual Food to the Soul; and the outward Food, which nourishes the Body: And telling us what becomes of this, he opposes two contrary Places of Scripture; one of our Saviour, teaching us, that whatever goes into the Mouth goes down into the Belly, and thence into the Draught; and the other of the Apostle, that makes a great Difference betwixt the Eucharist and

other Sorts of Food. The first Place makes no Exception at all of the Sacrament; but the second teaches us to distinguish it from our usual Food. That indeed it is eaten and swallowed down in the same Manner as our usual Food, putting it in our Mouths, and conveying it down into the Belly; but when 'tis come thither, none but the Lord knows how he disposes of it. For we know, says he, that it may be consumed by a Spiritual Power, that it may be kept for ever from Corruption, because God may do what he pleases with his Sacrament. But God forbid it should be subject to be conveyed into the Draught; or capable of being digested, corrupted or consumed by Heat, or altered by any other Cause, &c.

Erigerus makes a more strong Opposition against the Opinion of Rabanus, and says, 'twas a scandalous Thing for Heribaldus to propose such a Question to him, but more scandalous for Rabanus to have minded it, and most scandalous to have solved it as he has done. He declares himself against him, affirming that the Symbols of Bread and Wine are not voided out of our Bodies, nor changed into useless Humours or Excrements, but into our Flesh and Blood, to be raised again from the Dead.

Guitmondus was of the same Opinion with Erigerus; affirming, That, though a Man may be nourished by the Species of the Eucharist, yet no Part of it is turned into Excrements. That they are never putrified, corrupted, nor any Way altered, whatever they seem to be, either to try the Faith of the Elect, or to punish the Neglect of those who keep 'em too long. That no Vermin can gnaw 'em, no Beast eat 'em; and, if such a Thing happen, the Sacrament is, by Miracle, convey'd to some other Place. Now, to obviate this Objection, That if a Priest should consecrate one great Loaf, or several Loaves, a Man might live upon it, and shall void his Excrements in the usual Manner, he declares, that in this Case the Sacrament is also miraculously convey'd away, and an unconsecrated Loaf substituted in the Room of it by the Angels, or by the Evil Spirits, to cheat the Hereticks. Algerus speaks much to the same Purpose, and holds; That the Species do not come out of our Bodies by Excrements, but are annihilated. He utterly denies, that Excrements can arise from the Species eaten, and will not allow them to be corrupted or putrified, burnt, or altered in the least, though they seem so to be. Lastly, He taxes the Greeks with an erroneous Belief, That the Eucharist is liable to the same Laws and Contingencies with other Sorts of Food, because they say, That the Fast ordained by the Church is broken by the Communion; and calls 'em therefore by the infamous Name of *Stercoranists*. Which Accusation he got from Cardinal Humbertus, who lays the same Thing to the Charge of Nicetas Pectoratus. But he fathers upon him that Opinion, as a Consequence of his Assertion, that the Fast was broken by the Eucharist, and not as a Doctrine formally asserted by him. The Truth is, there is nothing of that in the Writings of Nicetas, who blaming the Latins for celebrating the Mass in Lent upon other Days than Saturday and Sunday, says, Their Practice is not well-timed, because celebrating the Mass at the third Hour, which is the Time appointed to offer this Sacrifice, they cannot keep the Fast till the ninth Hour. Afterwards he quotes some Canons, to prove the Unreasonableness of this Custom, and justifies the Practice of the Greeks, who offer this Sacrifice on Saturdays and Sundays only at the third Hour, and communicate on other Days at the ninth Hour, upon the presanctified Elements. So that Nicetas does not say positively, That the Fast is broken by the Eucharist; and, though he should say so, it would not follow, that he believ'd it subject to the same Laws and Contingencies as our usual Food, for that one might believe, that to ease one from the trouble of Fasting, and feed the Body in any Manner of Way, is *ipso Facto* to break the Fast; which is not the Thing insisted on by Nicetas, or the Greeks: Who believed, the Celebration of the Sacrifice broke the Fast, for that it is an Action full of Joy and Solemnity. This is the Reason given for it by Balsamon, upon the fourth Canon of the Council of Laodicea. 'To offer, says he, the Sacrifice, is to celebrate a Feast, and express the solemn Joy of the Church; and to do this, is not to weep or fast.' Besides, Nicetas does suppose, that presently after the Celebration of the Mass it is lawful to eat; and consequently that the Latins having finished in the Morning that Celebration of the Mass, broke the Fast presently after. In which Particular he errs; for the Latins did not celebrate Mass in Lent at the third Hour, but in the Evening, and so broke their Fast but late. However, neither Nicetas nor the Greeks did ever say, That the Body and Blood of Christ were under the same Laws as common Food; nay, 'tis probable, they did not believe, that the Species of Bread and Wine went into the Draught, their great Doctor St. John Damascene having taught the contrary. As for Algerus, he accused them of *Stercoranism*, only upon the Credit of Humbertus, whose Words he does but transcribe. And Humbertus charges Nicetas with it by a Consequence that has failed, and which does not necessarily follow. It does not appear, that there has been, since that Time, any farther Contest with them upon this Point; and amongst the Errors which the Latins affect-

afterwards condemned in *Michael Cerularius*, there is no Mention made of this, therefore this Error can by no Means be proved upon the *Greeks*.

Now, to come back to the *Latins*, we have sufficiently proved, that there was no Difference amongst them about the Flesh and Blood of our Saviour contained under the Species, that none was so much infatuated as to think, that that Mystical Flesh and Blood were subject to the same Laws and Contingencies with our usual Food; but that they had debated amongst them this Scholastical Question, what becomes of the Species of Bread and Wine? and that many of them being of Opinion, that it was indecent to conceive, that they were subject to the same Laws and Contingencies with our common Food, would not have it thought, that any part of it was converted into Excrements, or voided out of the Body, and therefore conceived

[To what is said in Page 84. *Paschasius* is of the same Opinion, and says, 'Tis a weakness to think, that any part of this 'Mystery is under the same Laws with other Food, this Note the Author hath added at the end of the Book, viz. This is not without difficulty, for *Paschasius* says well, *Frivolum est ergo, sicut in Apocrypho libro legitur, in hoc mysterio cogitare de stercore*. But this will bear two Interpretations; That it is a frivolous opinion to believe, That the Essential part of the Eucharist passes or returns; or, It is a frivolous question to trouble

that they were either annihilated, or converted into the Substance of our Flesh, to be raised again from the Dead. This Opinion, which had the Vogue in this and the following Centuries, has been since rejected by our Schoolmen, who doubt not but that the Species of the Eucharist may be corrupted and converted into another Substance, God by his Infinite Power producing another * Matter instead of that which is converted into a many Transubstantiations the Body and Blood of our Saviour. must follow upon the first Forgery. Transubstantiation on the Altar creates another in the

Belly, lest Christ's Body should be subject to indecent Evacuations. So necessary it is to fall into many Absurdities to maintain one wilful Error.

our selves about, whether it passes or not; since we need not to fear its mingling with other Aliments. I rather think that *Paschasius* is of the latter opinion; for though he asserts, that the Eucharist nourishes our Bodies, he does not intend that we should, by that word, understand a Carnal Nourishment of our Bodies, but a Spiritual Nutriture of our Souls. See the entire Passage in *Paschasius's* Treatise, Chap. 10. and the 80th. Page of this work.

C H A P. VIII.

The History of the Controversie about the Manner in which the Virgin Mary brought forth Christ.

Of the Controversie about the Manner of our Saviour's Birth. Ratramnus's Opinion about it.

Paschasius and *Ratramnus* had another Controversie about the Manner in which our Saviour came out of the Virgin's Womb. *Ratramnus* being informed, there were some in Germany that maintained, our Saviour did not come out of the Virgin's Womb, *per virginis januam vulvæ, sed monstruose de secreto ventris incerto tramite*; he thought such an Opinion dangerous, conceiving it followed from thence, that Christ was not truly born, but issued from the Virgin, *quod non est nasci, sed erumpi*. He therefore opposed it in a small Treatise, [Intituled, *De partu Virginis*] published by Father *Dacherius*, in the second Volume of his *Spicilegium*; wherein he owns it as an undoubted Truth, that *Mary* lived all her life-time a Virgin, *ante partum, in partu, & post partum*; but confutes those who believed, that our Saviour came not into the World *per Semitam Vulvæ*, but some other Way. He brings in against them several Places of Scripture, and Passages of the Fathers, which prove, that Christ came out of the Virgin's Womb; yet he owns withal, that he came out *per Vulvam clausam*, as he came into the Place where his Disciples were met, through the Door, and not through the Wall, yet without opening the Door.

Paschasius's Opinion of our Saviour's Birth.

Paschasius Rathbertus, who had been Abbot of *Corbey*, and who was then but one of the Private Monks (as appears by the Title he assumes in his Epistle Dedicatory) thinking that *Ratramnus*, heretofore his Monk, but who perhaps had, before this, quitted that Abby, had deliver'd, in his Treatise, such things as seemed prejudicial to the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*; and that he had disposed Men to believe, that she had brought forth our Saviour into the World in the same manner as other Women bring forth Children, *aperza scilicet Vulvæ*; did put out a Book of our Saviour's Birth against that of *Ratramnus*, wherein he confutes him, without naming of him, and charges him with the aforesaid Error; rejecting withal that Error of *Ratramnus's* Adversaries, *quod Christus non fuisset natus*. Therein he chiefly answers to St. *Ambrose* and St. *Jerome's* Passages, which might breed some Difficulty. This Book is dedicated to the Abbess and Nuns of *Soissons*. And whereas he calls the Abbess *Matrona Christi*, that gives us to understand, it was *Theodrada*, and not *Emma* that succeeded in 846. because, as is observed by Father *Mabillon*, that Title was only bestowed upon Abbesses that had lived in a married State.

This Answer of *Paschasius* proving ineffectual with the Followers of *Ratramnus's* Opinion, so as to convince them of their Error, who affirmed on the contrary, that they had done no Injury to the perpetual Virginity of *Mary*; He wrote another Book upon the same Subject, of which we have but a Fragment left. These are the two Treatises published by *Fou-ardentius*, (a) under the Name *Ildephonsus* of *Toledo*, which Father *Dacherius* has restored to their true Au-

thor upon the credit of several Manuscripts, and caused them to be printed in the 12th. Volume of his *Spicilegium*.

Ratramnus had another Controversie with a Monk of the same Abby of *Corbey*, who had asserted, that all Men were of one Substance, and had but one Soul. This Opinion was grounded upon a place of St. *Austine's* Treatise, of the Quantity of the Soul; but he held it immediately from one *Macarius*, the * Scot, i. e. an Irish-Man. *Ratramnus* sent him a Letter, to make him quit that Opinion. But this Monk, in his Answer, persisting still in the same, *Odo*, Bishop of *Beauvais*, who had been Abbot of *Corbey*, ordered *Ratramnus* to confute that Monk's Book, which he did; and made it appear, in Writing to *Odo*, that *Macarius's* Opinion was unwarrantable. This Treatise has not yet appeared in Print: but Father *Mabillon*, from whom we have this Information, saw it in a Manuscript of the Monastery of St. *Eligius* near *Noyon*.

Ratramnus had yet another Controversie about the Expression of *Trina Deitas*, and writ a Book against *Hincmarus*, to justify it; which Book is lost. Lastly, he attempted to confute the Objections of the *Greeks* against the *Latin* Church; his Treatise upon this Subject is yet extant, and we shall speak of it in its proper place. He lived till towards the latter end of this Century, and got himself such a Name, that there was no Question debated in his Time, but *Ratramnus* was desired to write upon it.

His Book of the Body and Blood of our Saviour was printed the first time at *Cologne*, in 1532. under the Name of *Bertramus*; and afterwards at *Basil* in 1550. They that were employed in the Censure of Books, in Execution of a Decree of the Council of *Trent*, did put it amongst the prohibited Books. Afterward *Sixtus Senensis*, *Despensius*, and *Genebrardus Santonensis*, look'd upon it as a Book forged by *Oecolampadius*. Pope *Clement* the VIII. did likewise reject it as an Heretical Book; wherein he was followed by *Bellarmino*, *Quirogo*, *Sandaval*, and *Alanus*. Yet notwithstanding, the Divines of *Louvain* making, in the year 1571, an Index *Expurgatorius* for *Flanders*, did not absolutely prohibit it, but only till it were corrected. This Opinion was followed by *Possévin*, and some others. Cardinal *Peron* did not think it spurious, though he was no Friend to

Of the Controversie about the Manner of our Saviour's Birth. A Question upon the Nature of the Soul.

The Fortune of *Ratramnus's* Book concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour.

(a) By *Fou-ardentius*.] The first Treatise of *Paschasius* is the second Treatise of *Ildephonsus*, beginning with these words, *Quamvis omnium Ecclesiarum Virginitas*, &c. But from Page 35, where these words are in the Margent, *hic aliquid desideratur*, you must go to Page the 42d. Line 13th. where the Remainder of this Treatise is found; though *Fou-ardentius* has published it as another Discourse. This second Treatise of *Paschasius* is

the Sermon which begins Page 47. *Inter Sanctarum*, &c. The end of the first Treatise may be part of this; being of the same Style, upon the same Subject, and likewise dedicated to the Nuns. But the other Sermons attributed to *Ildephonsus*, upon the Assumption, the Nativity and Purification of the Blessed Virgin, belong to another Author of later date than *Paschasius*, being either of the Twelfth, or the Thirteenth Century.

the Doctrine of it. In 1657. Monsieur de Marca laboured very hard to make it pass for Scotus's Book, in the Letter annexed to the second Volume of the *Spicilegium*: Which, in process of time, became a common Opinion, defended by Father Paris, in his Dissertation at the end of the first Part of his Book of Perpetuity, &c. Yet it does not appear, that the Author of this Book was altogether of that Opinion, or that he offer'd to decide who was the Author of that Treatise. But he made a Discourse upon that Author's Opinion; wherein he plainly shews, that he did not directly oppose the real Presence; though at the same time he owns, there are some Passages apt to make one believe, that he was no Favourer of it. Father Paris's Opinion in this case soon became the most prevalent amongst the Roman Catholics, whilst the Protestants maintain'd firmly, that that Book was *Ratramnus's*. But in 1680, Father Mabillon did clearly convince the Roman Catholics of their Prejudice in this case, by proving in his Preface to the second Volume of the fourth Age of *Benedictine* Writers, that the Book was *Ratramnus's*; and defended withal his Doctrine as Orthodox: Which Book was afterwards (*viz.* Anno 1672.) printed at Paris, according to the Manuscript of Lobbes, with a Translation into French, by a Doctor of the Sorbon, who writ the History of the Fortune of this Book, and defended its Doctrine in his Preface. Father Mabillon having thus both by stress of Argument, and the Authority of the Manuscripts by him quoted, reclaimed the best part of the Roman Communion from their Mistaken Opinion of Monsieur de Marca, and Father Paris, yet Father Hardouin stood it out against him; and in his Book of the Sacrament of the Altar, printed in 1689, endeavour'd to prove, he had a design of destroying the real Presence. The Protestants took care to have this little Book of *Ratramnus*, at divers times, printed and translated. There are extant some old Translations of it, printed in 1558, and 1560; and a new one, published in 1653. [But the best of these is that which was printed at London 1686, with an excellent Preface, vindicating *Bertram* from all Popish Objections, with much Reason and Learning.]

The other Treatises of *Ratramnus* have not been so well known, nor so often publish'd, and have not appear'd in publick before this Century. His two Books concerning Predestination were printed in the Collection made by Father Maignan of the Authors of the Ninth Century upon Grace, published in 1650. [Tom. I. p. 29. and are since put in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. XV.] and his two other Works, *viz.* That of our Saviour's Birth of the Virgin Mary, and the four Books against the Greeks, were put out by Father Ducherus. That of our Saviour's Birth, in the fourth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, which came out Anno 1653; and the four Books against the Greeks, in the second Tome of the same Collection, were printed in 1657.

Joannes (b) surnamed Scotus, or Erigena, from Ireland his Native Count-y, had likewise a great share in the Contests about the Eucharist and Grace. He came into France about the beginning of the Reign of Charles the Bald. (c) And being a Man of Parts and Learning, a good Peripatetic, and well skilled in the Greek Language, which few People were then well acquainted with in these Parts, (d) he got himself a good Fame, and was accordingly regarded by the King, who had a particular respect for learned Men. But, having introduc'd some Errors, for which he was cited by Pope Nicholas I. who writ to Charles the Bald to send him to Rome, or to expel him from the University of Paris, in which he made a good Figure, he took a dislike to France, and (e) withdrew into England about the year 864, where he died (f) about the year 874 (g) He seems not to be the same with Joannes Scotus Abbot of Etheling, who was Grimbaldu's Companion, and Master to Alfred.

One of the Principal Works of Joannes Scotus Erigena, John was his Treatise concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour: Which Book is lost, unless it were that which bears the Name of *Ratramnus*, the Improbability whereof we have sufficiently proved. In that Treatise he asserted, that the Sacraments of the Altar were not the real Body and Blood of Christ, but only a Remembrance of both. This Doctrine he did not fully explain: But if we may give credit to *Affelin*, that was the Drift of it. The Book was

ed a Martyr; but there is no certainty, whether that John the Sophister be the person we speak of, or another Man. But this is certain, that neither *Berengarius*, nor his Scholars, who have so much magnified John Scot, ever contended for his Martyrdom: Nor does it appear, that those Authors who were contemporary with him, or that writ soon after his death, did ever give him the Title of a Martyr. 'Tis possible, the Abbot of Etheling's death, who was stabb'd by some Assassins employ'd by his Monks, might be apply'd to John Scot; so that, by disguising the Story in some measure, he might be supposed to be the Man who was with Pen-knives stabbed by Scholars. And, by dating his Martyrdom on the 4th. of the Ides of November, the day on which another John Scot, a Bishop, was killed, Anno 1060, three distinct Johns will be blended into one, with the Epithet of Sophister proper to our Scot; that of Martyr proper to the Abbot of Etheling, and the day of the Bishop's Death. However we read in the Book of English-Martyrs, and also in a Roman-Martyrology printed at Antwerp in 1586, these words, *Eodem die* (speaking of the fourth day of the Ides of November) *Santi Joannis Scoti, qui Graphii Puerorum confossus Martyrii Coronam adeptus est.* But there's no such thing to be found in all the other Roman Martyrologies. The Reason why I date not his death before the year 874. is, because in some Greek and Latin Verses, written upon an ancient Glossary, bearing the name of John at the head of it, he speaks of Pope John, who was not raised to the Papal See till towards the end of the year 872. And if those Verses be his, 'tis like he was then come back into France.

(g) He seems not to be the same with Joannes Scotus Abbot of Etheling. The Reasons which induce me to believe, that our John Scot was not the Abbot of Etheling, are these: First, that the Abbot of Etheling was an East-Saxon, a Saxon of Germany, or at least of Essex, and John Scot an Irish-man. Secondly, The first was called into England by Alfred, and came thither with Grimbaldu after the year 880; whereas John Scot withdrew from France into England upon a disgust, and died before the year 875. Thirdly, The Abbot of Etheling was both Priest and Monk, which we do not read any where of John Scot; and he was himself so far from owning it, that he calls himself only *Servus*, or *extremus Servorum*, or *extremus Sophis Studentium*. But 'tis certain that he lived at Court, as appears by the Epistle sent him by *Paridul*, and by his Preface to the Book of Predestination. Fourthly, The Abbot of Etheling was slain by some Assassins in his Abby Church towards the year 895, being then a strong Man, and one that could defend himself, as *Afferus* avers it, who relates his death, and says, that he stood in his own defence, *quod billicosa Artis non expars esset*; whereas our Scot was dead long before: but put the case he had lived till then, he could not then be a strong Man, or able to make any defence. Fifthly, *William* of Malmesbury makes a distinction of those two Johns; but he mistakes in his Supposition, that they were both called into England by Alfred. *Afferus*, a Contemporary Author, makes mention but of one Scot called into England by Alfred.

(b) Surnamed Scotus, or Erigena, from Ireland his Country.] All the Ancients assure us, that this Author was a Scot. *Hincmarus* speaking of him, L. 1. de *Prædest. c.* 31. has these words, *Auctor jactitatur à multis Joannes Scoticus. Anastasius* the Library-keeper, *Joannem imo Scoticenam.* And Pope Nicholas, in a Letter to Charles the Bald, *Quidam ut Joannes genere Scotus.* The other Authors of that Time that wrote against him, call him John Scot, or simply Scot. And, 'tis well known, that in those Times Ireland, not Scotland, was called by the name of Scotia. *Trithemius* gives him the name of *Erigena*, or *Eringen*, which imports the same with Scot; Ireland, in the Language of his Country, being called *Eri*, or *Erim*.

(c) He came into France in the beginning of the Reign of Charles the Bald.] In 851. he had already raised his Reputation so high, that he was consulted about the Question of Predestination, as we have already observed; which is an Argument, that he was come hither before that Time, that is, about the beginning of Charles's Reign. But 'tis not likely that he did come with *Alcuinus* to found the University of Paris, or that he was a Disciple of *Beda*, as some Authors have pretended, because he died not till about the year 870.

(d) He became in a little time very eminent.] Pope Nicholas says of him, That he was a noted Man in the University of Paris. These are his words, *Aut certe Parisiis in Studio cujusdam olim capital fuisse perhibetur.* Certain it is, that Charles had a singular esteem for him, by whom he was consulted about the Question of the Eucharist; as he was by *Hincmarus* and *Paridul*, about the Doctrine of Predestination, &c.

(e) Withdrew (or fled) into England.] *Quare & Hæreticus putatus est*, says *Simon Dunelmensis*, *cujus Opinionis particeps fuisse dignoscitur Nicolaus Papa, qui ait in Epistola ad Carolum, Relatum est Apostolatu nostro, &c. Propter hanc ergo Infamiam rediit eum Franciæ, &c.* *Matthew* of Westminster, and *William* of Malmesbury speak much to the same purpose. Pope Nicholas I. being dead in 868. if Scot was forced by his Letter to return into England, he must have gone thither towards the year 864. which however does not agree with the Testimony of those Authors, who affirm, that he was called thither by King Alfred, who did not begin to addict himself to Learning till after the year 880, and that he was Companion to *Grimbaldu*, who quitted France not till after that year; it appearing by a Charter, that he was yet residing in his Abby, Anno 880.

(f) About the year 874.] *Anastasius* the Library Keeper, in a Letter to Charles the Bald, dated the 10th. of the Calends of April, Anno 875. speaks of him as of a dead Man: Which is another Argument against those Men's Opinion, who make this Scotus a Tutor to King Alfred, and Companion to *Grimbaldu*. What Death he died, is a Thing very uncertain. The fore-mentioned Historians, and many others say, That he suffered Martyrdom, and that he was slain by Children, that stabbed him to Death with Pen-knives. But *William* of Malmesbury, the first who related this Story, which was conveyed from him to the rest, speaks dubiously of it. 'Tis true, he relates certain Verses, made in honour of John the Sophister, written upon a Monument of Malmesbury-Church, where it is said, that he di-

dedicated to *Charles the Bald*, who had commanded him to write on this Subject. And *Berengarius* quoted this Author, as one that had taught the Doctrine he had stood for, wherein his Adversaries did not contradict him. But they condemned the Book of *John Scot*, as containing *Berengarius's Error*; and it was attainted for that reason by the Synods of *Vercelli*, *Paris* and *Rome*, by which means it might come to be lost. It was written against by *Aldrevaldus*, a Monk of the Abby of *Fleury*, who mulctured against it a Collection of Passages out of the Fathers, inserted into the 12th. Volume of the *Spicilegium*.

John Scot writ moreover two Books about Predestination; five Books of Natures, or about the Division of Natures, and a Book of Vision. We have already spoken of his Books of Predestination. The five Books of Natures are written by way of Dialogue, and in the same Style, that is, after a Scholastick Abstruse Manner. The Natures he divides into four Kinds, one that creates, and is uncreated; another that creates, and is created; a third that does not create, and is created; and a fourth which neither creates, nor is created. In the three first Books he treats of the three first Kinds of Nature; and in the fourth and fifth he explains the return of the created Natures into the Nature uncreated. In the second Book he handles the Controversie betwixt the *Greek* and *Latin* Churches, about the Procession of the Holy Ghost. He tells us, That God has created in his Son, from all Eternity, the Primogenial Causes of all Things, the Goodness by himself, Essence by himself, &c. That the World was created after Man had sinned; and that, if Man and Angels had not sinned, God would have created no Sensible and Material World. He asserts, That our Saviour's Manhood was perfectly changed into his Godhead, after his Resurrection. That the Malice and Punishments of the Infernal Spirits shall cease one Day, and come to a Period. That, after their Fall, they were clothed with Aereal Bodies. That the Damned shall enjoy all Natural Comforts. That all Creatures whatsoever shall be at last transformed into the Humane Nature. That our Bodies shall be turned into our Souls at the Day of Resurrection. And lastly, That all Things shall be converted into their Primogenial Causes, and return into God: So that, as before the World was created, there was no Being but God, and the Causes of all Things in God; so after the End of the World, there will be no Being but God, and the Causes of all Things in Him.

These Books, which are in Manuscript in the Library of *St. Germain des Prez*, were printed at *Oxford* in 1681. The Book of Vision doth still remain a Manuscript. Father *Mabillon* has found one in a Monastery near *St. Omer*; and says, That *John Scot* argues in that Book about the very same Question which is debated in the 30th. Letter of *Lupus* Abbot of *Ferrara*.

John Scot translated into *Latin* the Works fathered upon *St. Denys*, the Translation whereof he dedicated to *Charles the Bald*. Pope *Nicholas I.* wrote to that Prince about it, and desired it of him. *Anastasius* the Library-Keeper having perused it, found he had followed his Author too close, and that he had not taken a sufficient Care to shun Obscurity. This Work, with *Anastasius's* Letter, is in a Manuscript of the Library of the *Jesuits-College* at *Bourges* [and Part of it has been printed with *St. Denys's* Works, at *Cologne*, in 1536.] *Scot* has also translated some Comments of *Maximus* upon the Books of *St. Denys*; and his Translation of *Maximus's* Comments upon *St. Gregory Nazianzen* was printed at *Oxford* in 1681. *Tribemius* makes mention of a Commentary upon *St. Matthew's Gospel*, and of a Book of Offices composed by *John Scot*.

What we have hitherto said of *John Scot*, is a sufficient Proof, that he had some Tincture of Learning, and that he was skilled in Logicks and Metaphysics. But it is plain on the other side, that he had a thwarting Disposition, that he was but a weak Arguer, and a sorry Divine.

To conclude, what relates to the Subject Matter of this and the foregoing Chapter, all we have to do is to speak of the Works of *Paschasius Ratbertus*, upon which we have been hitherto silent.

He attempted a Commentary upon *St. Matthew's Gospel*, when he was yet a Monk, that is, before the Year 844. being chosen Abbot, the Duties of his Place made him discontinue it. Yet he began the fifth Book, where he had left off, and proceeded as far as the ninth, while he was yet Abbot. Having eased himself from the Burden of that Station, he went on with the rest more undisturbed. However he suspended it yet a while, his Time being taken up with other Works. And then it was he wrote a Commentary upon the Lamentations of *Jeremy*, and an Explication of the 44th. Psalm. But he took in hand the eleventh Book again, at the latter End of his Life, so that the Letter to *Bridegarius* was not written by *Paschasius* till about that Time.

Paschasius's Commentary upon *St. Matthew's Gospel* is very large. In it having explained the General Sense of every particular Place, he makes long Moral Reflections, taken for the most Part out of the Works of the Holy Fathers. The first four Books are dedicated to *Gontlandus* a Monk of *St. Riquier*; and the last, to the whole Body of Monks in that Abby.

The Explication of the * 44th. Psalm is dedicated to the Nuns of our Lady of *Soissons*, in Acknowledgment of the Benefits he had received from them. The same is divided into three Parts. The first is upon the Title of the Psalm, as in the *Septuagint*, *For the Beloved*; and in the *Hebrews*, *For the Lilies*, or *For the Flowers*: Whence he takes Occasion to enlarge upon the Praise of Virgins. In the second Part, he expounds that Part of this Psalm, which exalts the Beauty of the Bridegroom, and applies it to Christ. In the third, he applies to the Church what is there said of the Bride. To expound the Letter, he makes use of the Commentary attributed to *St. Jerome*; often comparing together the *Hebrew* Text, *Symmachus's* Version, and that of the *Septuagint*.

His Commentary upon the Lamentations of *Jeremy* is much more Allegorical than the former. Here you will find Mysteries upon the *Hebrew* Characters, the Use of which is only for Distinction. 'Tis a tedious Work, divided into five Books, and dedicated to a Monk called *Odilmanus Severus*. Therein he deplores the Vices and Licentiousness of his Age; as, amongst others, Simony, the Covetousness of several Priests, the corrupt Lives both of the Regular and Secular Clergy, who minded too much the Concerns of this World, the Usurpation of Church-Lands, and Grinding of the Poor. With Grief does he mention likewise, in the fourth Book, an Invasion made by Pirates, who had committed great Depredations to the very Gates of *Paris*: Which ought to be understood of the *Normans*, who, in the Year 856, or 857. burnt the Church of *St. Germain* in the Fields.

These are *Paschasius's* Works, which have been collected and published by Father *Sirmondus*, and printed at *Paris* in 1618. Since which Time Father *Dacherius* has published in the 12th. Volume of his *Spicilegium* a Treatise of our Saviour's Nativity, dedicated to *Theodrada*, Abbess of the Abby of our Lady of *Soissons*, who died in 846. In which he asserts, That our Saviour coming into the World, came out of the Virgin's Womb, by penetrating her Substance, and without any Opening.

To conclude, Father *Mabillon* has put out two Books of *Paschasius*, containing the Life of *St. Wala*, Abbot of *Corbey*. The first he composed when he was a Monk, towards the Year 856; And the second, after the Decease of his Friend *Severus*, about the Year 859. By this we learn several Particulars of the unjust Deposing of *Lewis*, surnamed the Godly, and the State of the Church of *France*. The Life of *Adelardus* is also attributed to him.

Paschasius was a Man of great Piety and Learning. He writes in a clear, neat and elegant Style. He was well read both in Ecclesiastick and Prophane Authors. He had withal pretty good Parts of his own; only it may be said perhaps, that he was a little too mystical. His Book upon the Eucharist is an accurate and elaborate Piece. His Encomium was made in Verse by *Eugemoldus*, and is to be seen in the Beginning of his Works. He died upon *St. Riquier's* Day towards the Year 860.

CHAP. IX.

The History of the Contest betwixt Photius and Ignatius, about the Patriarchal See of Constantinople.

IGNATIUS was Son of *Michael Curopalata* the Emperor, surnamed *Rengabis*; and of *Procopia*, Daughter of *Nicephorus* the Emperor. *Michael*, who succeeded his Father-in-Law, *Anno* 811. had not sat full two Years upon the Throne, when he was forced to resign the Empire into the Hands of *Leo the Armenian*. He had three Sons, *Theophilactus*, *Stauratius*, and *Nicetas*. The first two he had admitted to govern with him; but *Stauratius* happened to die, before he had quitted the Empire. *Theophilactus*

was shaven; and turned, with his Father, into a Monastery, and so was *Nicetas*, his youngest Brother, then but fourteen Years of Age. *Theophilactus*, upon his Coming into the Monastery, had his Name changed into *Eustratus*; and *Nicetas*, into that of *Ignatius*, the Prince we now speak of. *Leo the Armenian*, being resolved to secure unto himself the Empire he had got by Treachery, banished *Michael*, his Wife and Children, and sent them into several Islands, parting them from one another, and keeping them under a strict Guard;

Guard; and his two Children he made incapable of raising Issue to the Family, to which the Imperial Crown did of Right belong. He declared against the Use of Images, and turned *Nicephorus* the Patriarch out of his See of *Constantinople*, to make Room for *Theodosius*, an Enemy of Images. *Leo* having quietly enjoy'd the Empire some Months above seven Years, was slain by *Michael*, surnamed *Balbus*, or the *Stammerer*, who raised to the See of *Constantinople*, after the Death of *Theodosius*, *Anthony*, surnamed *Byrsodepsa*, who was Metropolitan of *Perga*. *Theophilus*, Son of *Michael* the *Stammerer*, succeeded his Father, Anno 819. and raised *John Iconomachus* to the See of *Constantinople*, in the Room of *Anthony*. At last *Theophilus* dying in the Year 841. the Government fell into the Hands of *Theodora*, as the Guardian of *Michael*, Son to *Theophilus*. This Princess expelled *John* from his See of *Constantinople*, and caused *Methodius* to be ordained again, who was four Years possessed of that See. After his Death, *Ignatius*, who, till that Time, had lived a Monastick Life in the Isles of *Hiatres*, and *Terebinthus*, by him peopled with Monks, was raised to that Dignity in 847. He had been ordained Priest by *Basil*, Bishop of *Perea*. At that Time there was a Brother of *Theodorus*, Uncle to *Michael*, called *Bardas*, who had a great Share in the Government. This Man was desperately in Love with his Daughter-in-Law, with whom he held a secret Commerce. *Ignatius* offended at so great a Lewdness, rebuked him for it, with a Freedom suitable to his Character. And observing *Bardas* still persisting in his wicked Course, he refused to give him the Sacrament upon the Twelfth-day. *Bardas*, a mighty Man, and of a cruel Temper, incensed at his Refusal, took his Time to break out into an open Resentment of it. Not long after this, designing to rid himself of *Theodora*, who shared the Empire with him, he persuaded *Michael*, That it was Time for him to reign by himself; and advised him to send away his Mother and Sisters into some Monastery. The Emperor, following his Advice, commanded the Patriarch to see that Business done, who refused to obey that Order: Which Refusal made Way for *Bardas* to accuse him as an Abettor of the Rebellion of a certain Person, who pretended to be a Son of *Theodora* by another Husband. *Michael*, in the mean Time, caused his own Mothers and Sisters to be shaven, and shut up into a Nunnery; afterwards turns out *Ignatius*, and banishes him into the Isle of *Terebinthus*, requiring him several Times to resign; but although he could not obtain it from him, yet he put *Photius* in his Place.

This *Photius* was descended from a noble Family of *Constantinople*, and Nephew of *Tarasius* the Patriarch. He was raised to the chief Dignities of the Empire, being made Principal Secretary of State, Captain of the Guards, and Senator. He was both a refined Statesman, and a Person of profound Learning. So great a Grammarian he was, and so well versed in Poesy, Philosophy, Physick, and other Sciences; and (as the Author of the Life of the holy Patriarch *Ignatius* observes it) so great a Master of Eloquence, that he might pass, without Contradiction, for the greatest Man of his Age in Point of Learning, and might even be compared with the Ancients. In short, he had all the Parts requisite for an able Man; a happy Genius agreeable to a studious Life, and a good Estate to get him a good Library of Books; but, above all, so great a Desire to raise his Reputation, that it made him pass whole Nights in the Course of his Studies: And, whereas he aimed at the Patriarchal Dignity, he diligently apply'd himself to the reading of such Ecclesiastical Writings as might fit him for it.

He was yet but a Layman, when he was chosen Patriarch: But, that he might be, as it were, gradually raised to that Dignity, he was made Monk the first Day, Reader the next, and the following Days Subdeacon, Deacon and Priest. So that in the Space of six Days, he attained to that Dignity, which fell out on *Christmas-day*, Anno 858. He was ordained by *Gregory Asbestas*, formerly Bishop of *Syracuse*, but degraded at *Rome*, whereupon he withdrew into *Constantinople*. *Ignatius*, unwilling that he should assist at his Ordination, had forewarned him not to appear in the Ceremony, and signify'd unto him his Desire, that his Affair should be examined, and Judgment passed upon it, before he held any Correspondence with him: Which *Gregory* being much offended at, he, from that Time, declared himself *Ignatius's* Enemy, and separated from the Church, with *Peter* Bishop of *Sardis*, *Eulampius* of *Apamea*, and some others of the Clergy: Whom therefore *Ignatius* the Patriarch cited before him, and caused to be excommunicated. They writ against him to the Pope, who required of *Ignatius*, that he would send some Person to *Rome* to give him a full Information of that Affair. *Ignatius* did accordingly send one *Lazarus*; and the Point being duly examined by the Direction of Pope *Benedictus*, the next Successor to *Leo*, *Ignatius's* Sentence was approved of by the Holy See. The Schism however continued during the eleven Years *Ignatius* was in the Bishoprick of *Constantinople*, who could not reduce *Gregory*, nor those of his Party, to their Duty; because he had so great an Interest amongst the *Grandeers*, and with *Photius* in particular.

VOL. II.

The Metropolitans, subject to the Patriarchal See of *Constantinople*, acknowledged *Photius*; but they extorted from him a Promise in Writing, that he should respect *Ignatius* as his Father, and should by no Means persecute him. Yet, notwithstanding this Promise, two Months after *Photius* was raised to that See, *Ignatius's* Friends were secured, and himself accused of a Conspiracy against the Government. He brought an Information against him, and removing him from the Isle of *Terebinthus*, whither he had withdrawn himself, he was convey'd to another Island called *Hiera*, from thence to *Berneta*, and afterwards to *Numeta*, where he was very ill used, bound with Chains, and cast into Prison: From thence he was carried to *Mitylene*; and, whilst he was there, *Photius* having called a Council together, pronounced his Deposition, and an *Anathema* against his Person.

Photius having thus secured himself in his Patriarchal Dignity, was not fully satisfied; but being desirous to get this Sentence confirmed by the Bishop of *Rome*, sent two Bishops to Pope *Nicholas*: Whom he pray'd to send two Legates to *Constantinople*, to re-establish the Church-Discipline, and utterly extirpate the Residue of the Sect that opposed Image-worship, being resolved to compel them to approve of *Ignatius's* Deposition. For he did not formally desire of the Pope the Approbation of it, but he gave him to understand, that *Ignatius* had voluntarily quitted the Patriarchal See, by reason of his Age and Craziness, and had withdrawn himself into a Monastery belonging to a certain Island, and that he was in great Esteem both with the Princes and People. Upon this Request, Pope *Nicholas* sent two Bishops to *Constantinople*, viz. *Zachary* and *Radoaldus*, with the Character of Legates *a latere*, with full Power to regulate the Business of the *Iconoclasts*, and to inform themselves so far only of *Ignatius's* Deposition, as to make the Report thereof to the Holy See. At the same time he wrote both to *Michael* the Emperor, and to *Photius* himself, about the Deposition of *Ignatius*. In his Letter to the Emperor, he expresses his Dislike, that *Ignatius* had been deposed without consulting the Holy See about it, and that a Layman was put into his Place, contrary to the Canons of the Church, and the Decrees of the Popes. He therefore declares to him, That he cannot give his Assent to *Photius's* Ordination, before he is fully informed by his Legates of the whole Matter of Fact; That he desired, *Ignatius* should be cited before them and the Council; to ask him the Reason, Why he left his Flock; and to enquire whether his Deposition was made canonically; And that, when he should have a true Account of Things, he would decide the Matter by an Apostolick Decree, according to the true Merit of the Cause. Next, he recommends the Worship of the Images of Jesus Christ, the Virgin *Mary*, and Saints, proving the Lawfulness of it by the Tradition of the Church, and some Instances out of the Old Testament. To which he adds, That as Altars are sanctify'd by Benediction, and as the Bread, after Consecration, is in Reality the Body of Christ, and the Wine becomes his Blood; so the Wood, whereof a Cross is made, is but common Wood, before 'tis brought into the Form of a Cross; but when it has once receiv'd that Form, it becomes holy, and the Horrour of Devils, by reason of our Saviour's Figure upon it. He exhorts the Emperor, to restore to the Pope the Authority he formerly had, by his Vicar the Bishop of *Theffalonica*, over the old and new *Epirus*, over *Illyria*, *Macedon*, *Theffaly*, *Achaia*, the two *Dacia's*, *Moesia*, *Dardania*, and *Prevalitania*. And, to assert it as his Right, he sent to the Emperor some Letters of his Predecessors. He farther requires the Restitution of the Papal Patrimonies in *Calabria* and *Sicily*; and that the Archbishop of *Syracuse* might be ordained by the Holy See. Lastly, he tells him, that he sends him, as Legates, *Radoaldus* Bishop of *Porto*, and *Zachary* of *Agnania*; whom he desires him to receive with a Respect suitable to their Character; to give them frequent and favourable Audiences, to give Credit to their Informations; not to suffer 'em to be ill-intreated, and to send them back under a safe Guard. These are, in short, the Contents of Pope *Nicholas's* Letter to the Emperor. That to *Photius* is shorter; wherein he expressed, how joyful he was to understand by his Letters the Steadfastness of his Faith, but that he was grieved on the other side, to see such Violations made of the Canons of the Church, in the Business of his Promotion, being as it were, all at once raised from a Layman, to the Dignity of a Patriarch; wherein he had transgressed the Canons, and the Decrees of the Popes, so that he could not approve of his Ordination, before he were fully informed by his Legates he had sent to *Constantinople* of his Morals, Conduct, and Affection to the Doctrine of the Church; And that, when he should be fully satisfy'd about it, he would honour him according to his Station, and give him real Proofs of his Brotherly Love. These two Letters, dated Sept. 25th. 860. being this Pope's second and third Letters, were given to his Legates, upon their Departure for *Constantinople*.

Whilst an Answer was expecting from *Rome*, *Ignatius* was remanded to the Isle of *Terebinthus*, where he suffered much from the Emperor's Officers, and by an Inroad the

Z

Scythians

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

The Council of
Constantinople
against
Ignatius.

Scythians made into it, who plunder'd the Island and all the Monasteries; so that he was constrained to withdraw himself into a private House at *Constantinople*.

The Pope's two Legates being come to *Constantinople*, the Emperor called a Council thither in 861. which consisted of 318. Bishops, the Pope's Legates assisting at it. *Ignatius* was cited to appear at this Council by the Commissioners, to answer to the Charge exhibited against him. He demanded of those Officers that came to cite him, Whether he must appear in a Bishop, Priest, or Monk's Habit? They being startled at it, could give him no Answer, But that he should hear from them about it the next Day; when they came back to him, and cited him a second Time, in the Names of *Zachary*, and *Radoaldus* the Pope's Legates, to appear before the Synod in the Habit which he thought in his Conscience most proper for him. Upon which he put on his Patriarchal Vestments, and marched forth, attended by Bishops, Clerks, Monks, and a world of People, towards the Church, wherein the Assembly was. Being come over against St. *Gregory's* Church, at a Place where a great Cross stood upon a Marble-Pillar, in the middle of the Street, a Nobleman, sent by the Emperor, came to tell him, That if he did not appear in a plain Monk's Habit, 'twould go near to cost him his Life. *Laurentius* the Priest, and the two *Stephens*, did likewise forewarn him, not to come in his Pontifical Habit. *Ignatius* forced to obey, was dragged alone into the Synod, habited like a Monk. He was no sooner come in, but the Emperor fell upon him with opprobrious and virulent Language; but after a while, being a little cooler, he commanded him to sit down on a Wooden Bench. He begged Leave to salute *Radoaldus* and *Zachary*, which was granted him. He asked them who they were, and what their Commission was? To which they answer'd, That they were Legates from Pope *Nicholas*, to take Cognizance of his Affair. He farther asked them, Whether they had any Letter from his Holiness for him? They answered, They had none: Supposing they had not to do with a Patriarch, but with a Man deposed in a Provincial Synod. Then he charged them to expel the Adulterer, who had, by Force, possessed himself of his See; declaring withal, That if they had not Power to do it, they had none to be his Judges. They answer'd, That they had Power from the Emperor to be Judges in his Affair. Whereupon *Ignatius* was pressed by the Courtiers to make his Resignation, by which the Metropolitans were awed that solicited his Restoration. Thus was the first Day spent in Heats and Contentions, so that the Assembly was adjourned to another Day. Mean while *Ignatius* was pressed very hard to a Resignation, which he would never yield unto. Being cited again to appear before the Council, he answer'd, He would not appear, and that he would never own for his Judges Men that appeared so visibly prepossessed against him; who were so far from expelling *Photius*, that they did daily eat at his Table, and to whom he had sent Presents before their Arrival. That he appealed to the Pope, and was willing to submit himself to his Judgment. Those who stood for him required the same Thing. To make out the Justice of his Demand, he alledged *Innocent's* Letter to *Chrysostome*, and the Canon of the Council of *Sardis*, touching the Review of the Bishop's Causes: Which notwithstanding, being pressed to appear in the Council, he urged, That those who had caused him to be summoned thither did not understand the Canons, nor the Practice of the Church, that a Bishop must be cited by two Bishops, not (as he was) by two Persons, one a Layman, the other a Deacon. But his Arguments not being able to prevail against Violence, he was forced into the Council; wherein appeared against him several Witnesses, deposing, That his Ordination was invalid, because he was chosen by Favour: He rejected those Witnesses, as produced by the Emperor; adding, That if he were not Archbishop, the Emperor was no Emperor, nor any of those Bishops truly so, for that they had been all consecrated by him. He said further, That *Photius* being an Adulterer, was no Member of the Church; and that he could not set himself up to rule, and feed Christ's Flock. First, Because he was one of those that were condemned and excommunicated. Secondly, Because of a Layman he was made a Patriarch so suddenly. Thirdly, Because he owed his Ordination to an excommunicated and deposed Bishop. Fourthly, Because having given a Promise in Writing, That he would never molest him, he had broken his Oath within 40. Days after his Intrusion. To which no Answer was given; but instead of it he was pressed again to resign, which he constantly refused. So that the Assembly broke up this second time. as the first, *re infecta*. In the following Sessions, the Emperor caused no less than 72. Witnesses to be heard; who deposed, That he was not raised to the Patriarchal See according to the Canons; but, with much Bribery, and by the Emperor's Favour. Whereupon was read the thirteenth of the Apostles Canons, which ordains, That if any one becomes a Bishop by the Secular Power, he ought to be deposed. In fine, after a long Deliberation, the Council pronounced his Deposition; and bringing him before them, his Pontifical Habit was put on, and he was presently divested of the same.

Image-worship was another Thing debated in, and confirmed by this Council; the Acts whereof were accordingly divided into two Parts, one about Images, and the other about *Ignatius's* Deposition. Therefore perhaps the *Greeks* call it, The first and second Synod; or, if we rather give Credit to *Zonaras*, and *Balsamon*, 'twas because the Resolutions taken at the first Session being not set down in Writing, by reason of some Troubles, another Sitting was appointed, in which the Determinations of both were reduced into Writing. These two Authors give us an Account of XVII. Canons made in this Assembly.

The 1st. is, To prevent an Abuse in the Foundation of Monasteries. For many of the Founders retained the Property thereof, and disposed of Monasteries as of their other Estates. To prevent which Disorder, 'tis ordained by this Canon, That no Monastery shall be erected, but with the Bishop's Advice and Consent, who is to consecrate it; That an Inventory shall be made of the Situation, and Appurtenances of the Monastery, and all that belongs to it, which shall be kept in the Archives of the Bishoprick; and that it shall not be lawful for the Founder to make himself Superior of it, or to make any other that he thinks fit, without the Bishop's Concurrence.

The 2^d. Canon is levelled against those who put on a Monk's Habit, without observing the Rules and Constitutions of a Monastick Life. To redress which Grievance, 'tis ordained by this Canon, That a Monk shall do nothing but by the Superior's Direction, to whose Rules he is subject, and in whose Monastery he shall be bound to live.

The 3^d. enjoins the Superiors to make an Enquiry after such Monks as have left their Monasteries, and to shut them up again.

The 4th. prohibits the Monks to quit their Monasteries, either to retire themselves into Secular Houses, or to change Monasteries; leaving the Bishops a full Power to remove them, if they think it necessary.

The 5th. imports, That the Monks Habit shall be given only to such as have been proved three Years, except in Case of Diseases, which may allow of a shorter Time; or when such as are admitted, have formerly led a Kind of Monastick Life in the World, it is sufficient, in this Case, to keep them in the State of Novices six Months.

The 6th. Canon declares, That Monks ought to have nothing of their own; that, before they turn Monks, they may freely dispose of their Estates; but after they are entered, the Monastery has the sole and entire Property of all they have, and they are disabled from using, or disposing of it as their own. That in case it be discovered, that any of them has retained an Inheritance to his own proper Use, it ought to be sold, and the Money given to the Poor. All which Regulations extend, by Act of the Council, not only to Monks, but in like Manner to Nuns.

The 7th. forbids all Bishops to found Monasteries at the Charge of their Dioceses: Which was to prevent the Ruin of Bishopricks, the Bishops in those Times being apt to bestow all their Cares and the Incomes of their Bishopricks, upon erecting and founding of Monasteries.

The 8th. is against such as voluntarily assumed to themselves the Office of Bishop, or caused themselves to be made such, without an urgent Necessity, as in case of Disease. And such it condemns to be deposed, if Clergymen; and if Laymen, to be excommunicated.

The 9th. is against those who strike and abuse others.

The 10th. ordains, That those shall be deposed who shall take upon them to convert into prophane Uses, Vessels, or Sacred Vestments, made use of at the Altar.

The 11th. forbids all Clergymen to take upon them Secular Employments, or Offices.

The 12th. forbids to celebrate, or administer the Sacraments in private Chappels, without the Bishop's Consent.

The 13th. prohibits all inferior Clergymen to separate from their Bishop, before he be try'd and condemn'd by his Judges.

The 14th. contains the same Prohibition to Bishops, in Relation to their Metropolitan.

By the 15th. the same Thing is ordered to be observed, in Relation to the Patriarch; except in Case of Heresie, if the Patriarch do publicly teach it. In which Case those that forsake his Communion, before the Judgment of the Synod, ought not only not to be deposed, but are worthy of Praise for so doing: Which ought to be understood of a manifest and condemned Heresie.

The 16th. enjoins, That no Bishop shall be ordained in a Church, the Bishop whereof is still living, unless he has voluntarily resigned his Bishoprick, or has been deposed in due Form. But, if a Bishop do forsake his Flock, and absents himself six Months from his Church, without a lawful Occasion, he ought to be deposed, and another put in his Place.

The 17th. forbids to raise a Layman or a Monk immediately to the Episcopal Dignity.

These are the Canons said to be made by this Council. The first appear to have been made indirectly against *Ignatius*; but the two last do plainly condemn the Conduct of *Photius*: Which might suggest a Belief, that they were made

made by another Synod, but that 'tis usual with Men to appear most severe against those Disorders they themselves have been guilty of.

Photius was not satisfy'd in deposing *Ignatius*, and stripping him unhandſomely of his Sacerdotal Habit; but to extort a Relinquishment from him, he caus'd him to be shut up in a close narrow Prison, where he received very ill Usage. And there he was forced to make a Cross over a Writing, the Contents of which were, that he own'd himself unworthy of being a Bishop, and that he had not been duely rais'd to the Patriarchal Dignity, but with Bribing and Favour; and that he was not the lawful Possessor of it, but an Usurper. This Signature being thus extorted from him, he was left undisturbed in the Palace of *Pope*. Mean while he drew a Petition, by way of Appeal, to the Pope; wherein having represented his Case to his Holiness, as it is related here, he begs of him that he will commiserate him, and lend him his helping Hand, in imitation of his Predecessors *Fabian*, *Julius*, *Innocent*, *Leo*, and all those that have laboured for the Propagation of the Faith and Truth.

But *Ignatius's* Adversaries, not contented with his forced Relinquishment, perswaded the Emperor, that it was fit he should publicly read it himself in the Church, and anathematize himself. In order to which, upon a *Whitsunday*, his House was beset with Guards: Which *Ignatius* perceiving, made his Escape in a Country-man's habit, with Baskets, and got over into the Islands, where he absconded, shifting frequently his Habitation, for fear of being discover'd. In *August* following there happened an Earthquake at *Constantinople*, which the People attributed to the Persecution of *Ignatius*. For which reason, the Princes were forced to promise, that he should no more be molested, nor any Harm done him for having concealed himself, nor to any Person or Persons that had concealed him: Which Promise being made publick, *Ignatius* discovered himself, and was sent back into his Monastery, there to live in quiet. Whereupon the Earthquake ceased, and the *Bulgarians* were converted.

Zachary and *Radoaldus* being returned to *Rome*, declared only to the Pope, by word of Mouth, that *Ignatius* had been deposed, and *Photius* rais'd in his stead to the See of *Constantinople*, but concealed from him the share they had in it.

Two days after came an Ambassador, named *Leo*, from the Emperor, with two Volumes, containing the Acts of the Council at *Constantinople*; one concerning *Ignatius's* Deposition, and the other about Images. He also brought a Letter from the Emperor to the Pope, wherein he desired his Assent, under his own Hand, to the Deposition of *Ignatius*, and the Promotion of *Photius*. At the same time a Monk, by Name *Theognostus*, came to *Rome* from *Ignatius* in a Layman's Habit, who inform'd the Pope of what had pass'd. The Pope, far from doing what the Emperor desired of him, wrote immediately a Letter to all the Patriarchs, wherein he declar'd his Dislike of *Ignatius's* Deposition, and *Photius's* Intrusion. He wrote likewise to *Michael* the Emperor, that he would never yield his Consent to the Deposition of *Ignatius*, nor the Ordination of *Photius*. And, whereas, to justify this last, *Nectarius* and *St. Ambrose* were alledged as two Precedents, being made of Laymen Bishops; he makes it out, that they had a particular Calling, and that they had not been ordained to thrust a Bishop out of his See. He answers farther to the same Instances, and that of *Tarasius*, in the Letter he writ at the same time to *Photius*, that it is for the Good of the Church, through Necessity, or by a particular Inspiration of God, that the Laws of the Church have been dispensed with upon such Occasions; but that none of those Reasons could take place in his Ordination. He complains, that *Photius* refuses to own or observe the Pope's Decretals, because they condemn his Ordination. He does acknowledge, that some Churches may have particular Customs different from those of *Rome*. But he maintains withal, that this Way of ordaining a Layman Bishop, contrary to the Canons, and the General Laws of the Church, ought not to be tolerated. His farther Complaints are, That his Legates were not us'd with that Respect he expected; that they had been detain'd a long time without the Freedom of speaking to any one, and that they had been forced by Threats to consent to the Deposition of *Ignatius*, and the Intrusion of *Photius*. These three Letters are under the same Date, viz. *March 18th. 862.*

The Pope having sent them to *Constantinople*, and other parts of the World, a Council was call'd by His Holiness at *Rome*, in order to have this Business thoroughly examined. The Pope knew not at first how much his own Legates had contributed to the Deposition of *Ignatius*, and thought they had been forced to it. But, hearing that they had been corrupted by *Photius*, and that they themselves had deposed *Ignatius*, and own'd *Photius*, he thought himself bound, for the Vindication and Honour of the Holy See, to call this Synod. *Radoaldus* did not appear, but *Zachary* did; who being convicted to have had a hand in the Deposition of *Ignatius*, and to have acknowledged *Photius* as the lawful Patriarch, he was deposed and excommunicated. He afterwards did acknowledge his Fault, declaring, that he

had acted contrary to the Orders he had received from the Holy See, by consenting to the Deposition of *Ignatius*. *Radoaldus* being absent, his Condemnation was put off till another time.

This Council did also take into their Consideration the Difference betwixt *Ignatius* and *Photius*, and confirm'd Image-worship, as may be seen by the six Articles insert'd into the seventh Letter of *Pope Nicholas*.

The first declares, that *Photius* being a Layman ordain'd a Patriarch by *Gregory* of *Syracuse*, for having invaded the See of *Constantinople*, and thrust out *Ignatius* the lawful Possessor thereof; for having held Communion with Persons excommunicated by the Holy See; having corrupted the Pope's Legates; having banished and persecuted the Bishops who would not acknowledge him; is therefore degraded from his Sacerdotal Office, and all Orders Ecclesiastical, by the Authority of God, of the Princes of the Apostles, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, of all the Saints, of the six General Councils, and by the Judgment of the Holy Ghost; and if, after this Judgment, he continues in possession of that See, he is excommunicated, with all such as shall abet him, or hold Communion with him.

The second contains the like Sentence of Deposition against *Gregory* of *Syracuse*, and a Commination against him, if he continues to raise Troubles against *Ignatius*; and such as hold Communion with him are hereby declared excommunicated.

In the third Article, all such as *Photius* has promoted to Orders, and have held Communion with him, after his Instruction, are declared to have been unlawfully ordained, and their Orders to be void accordingly.

The fourth enjoyns the Restoration of *Ignatius*, though he never was truly deposed, nor justly condemned or degraded; and declares, that all Persons that shall hinder him from assuming again his Sacerdotal Habit, from performing the Duties of his Place, or from the peaceable Enjoyment of his See, shall be deposed and excommunicated.

The fifth enjoyns, that all Persons exiled upon this account, be restored to their several Stations; and declares, all that shall obstruct it to be excommunicated.

The sixth confirms what had been decreed by the Popes touching the Images of *Jesus Christ*, the Holy Virgin, and the Saints; and pronounces an Anathema against *John* of *Constantinople* and his Followers, who taught, that they ought to be broken, and trampled under our feet.

To these six Articles, *Pope Nicholas* adds two Decisions, made in a former Synod, against those who held, that our Saviour's Godhead had suffered upon the Cross. By the first it is determin'd, that our Saviour indeed suffered in his Flesh, but that his Godhead remain'd Impassible. And the second pronounces an Anathema against those who shall say, that our Saviour suffered in his Godhead.

Radoaldus, whose Judgment was put off, being returned into *Italy* from *France*, the Pope sent some Bishops, to summon him to appear at the Synod. But he conceal'd himself so well, that they could find him no where. *Anno 863.* he came suddenly into *Rome*, where he combin'd for some time with the Pope's Enemies; but durst not stay till the Synod sat, which was put off by reason of the Troubles. He fled from *Rome*, spoiled his Church, and took Sanctuary in another Diocese. But in the Year 864. he was deposed and excommunicated in the Synod which then sat, with Threats of Anathema, if he held Communion with *Photius*.

Michael the Emperor having received the Pope's Letter, sent him a very sharp Answer, expressing his Discontent. To which the Pope made a long Reply, confuting, Article by Article, what the Emperor had written: Who complaining as if he had been ill us'd by the Holy See, tho' since the sixth Council, no Emperor of the *Greeks* had honoured the Holy See so much as he had: The Pope makes him this Return, that he has not abus'd him in any manner, but only warn'd and rebuk'd him, as Bishops ought to do; and that, if his Predecessors did not bear the Honour that was due to the Holy See, 'twas because most of them were Hereticks, when those that were good Catholics had always a Veneration and Respect for the Holy See. The Emperor, speaking of the Legates, he desired the Pope to send him, had us'd the word *to Command*: Which hard Expression the Pope could not digest, and therefore brought in several Instances of Emperors, who writing to the Popes, had us'd the words *to Pray*, or *to Desire*; and says, that in the Letter sent him by *Michael*, he himself had us'd the word *to earnestly Intreat*, *Obsecramus*. Nor does he pass by the Epithet of *Barbarous*, given by the Emperor to the *Latin* Tongue; but tells him very seriously, that he ought to have spoken better of a Language made by God himself, made use of in the Inscriptions of the Cross; and in which God is worshipp'd amongst the *Latins*. To which he adds, that he who glories in being the Emperor of the *Romans*, should not despise the *Roman* Tongue. The Emperor had signify'd in his Letter, that he had not required the Legates to be Judges a second time in the Cause of *Ignatius*. And the Pope makes him this Return, that the Event is a Proof, that was his Design; that, for his part, he

Of the Contest between Photius and Ignatius. he had given them no Power but to get an Information of the Matter, and make him the Report thereof, but not to give Judgment in the Case. That those who had condemned *Ignatius*, were his Enemies, or Excommunicate Persons either suspected, or accused, and so could not be his Judges; and that they were all inferior to him, having consequently no Power to sit upon, much less to depose him. Upon which last Head he does much enlarge, endeavouring to prove by Instances, as well as by the Authority of the Popes and Councils, that the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* can be brought to no Judgment but the Pope's. He maintains, that the Emperor could not call a Synod, and much less bring his Officers thither.

The Emperor had sent him Word, That the Council by which *Ignatius* was deposed, was as numerous as the *Nicene* Council. To which the Pope answers; That it is not the Number, but the Merit and Worth of the Bishops assembled in Council, which ought to be regarded; That no Patriarch was present at this, and all the Bishops were Suffragans of *Constantinople*; That the small Number ought to be no Prejudice, provided they act from a Pious Principle; and a great Number availeth nothing, if Ungodliness be at the bottom of their Proceedings. That on the contrary, the greater the Number of the Wicked is, the more easily they may compass their wicked Designs. The Emperor had writ, That he desired Legates only upon the account of Images. And the Pope makes him this Return, That he made it only his Pretence, and that his Aim was to make use of them against *Ignatius*. But he declines an Answer to what the Emperor had alledged against the Privileges of *Rome*, and contents himself to say, That they are Divine and Perpetual; That they may be assaulted, but not overthrown; that they were not granted by Councils, but owned and respected. The Emperor had demanded of him *Theognostus*, and some other Monks of *Ignatius's* Party, who had taken Sanctuary at *Rome*. But the Pope refused to deliver them up. He affirms and proves, by the Example of *St. Athanasius*, and the Testimony of Pope *Julius*, that he had a Power to cite both *Photius* and *Ignatius* to *Rome* and to be Judge of their Difference. Yet he is willing, if they cannot come in Person, to receive their Deputies. He wishes that *Photius* should send him, on his part, the Bishop of *Syracuse*, with others left to his Choice; and names the Deputies that shall appear in behalf of *Ignatius*. He consents that the Emperor shall send thither Officers from him, and says, the Business shall be judged at *Rome* by his Council.

In another Letter written to the same Emperor, Nov. 13. 866. and sent him by Legates, he exhorts him to yield to his Reasons. He gives him an Account, how *Zachary* and *Radbaldus* were deposed, for having exceeded their Power, in condemning *Ignatius*. He complains, that the first Letter he had written had been counterfeited, and makes it appear, that the Council held against *Ignatius* had not proceeded in a Legal Manner: and that he should have been reinstated before his Cause was judged. He requires from the Emperor, that he would cause that injurious Letter he had sent him, to be burnt, and threatens with Excommunication the Inditers of it.

Other Letters of Pope Nicholas about the Affair of Ignatius. At the same time he sent to the Clergy of *Constantinople* an Account in Writing of what had passed at *Rome* about the Concern of *Photius* and *Ignatius*; *Photius* in particular he charges with several Things, in a Letter directed to him. In another to Prince *Bardas* he expresses the Dissatisfaction he lies under, to see those Hopes frustrated which he had entertained of him; and advises him to recollect himself, and to protect *Ignatius*: Whom he informs on the other side of what he had done for him; and comforts him in his Condition. *Theodora* the Empress he praises in another Letter, exhorting her to Patience, and assuring her that he would do his utmost to restore *Ignatius*. He intreats *Eudoxia* to protect him, and desires the same of the Senators of *Constantinople*. Thus you have the Substance of the sixteen first Letters of Pope *Nicholas*, collected by himself, and sent into all Parts, to inform the whole World of this Affair, and of his Conduct in it.

Ill Treatment made to Ignatius. But whilst Pope *Nicholas* laboured hard to reinstate *Ignatius* in his See, *Photius* and *Bardas* were no less active and industrious to bring him to a fatal End. *Photius* suborned a Man, and caused him to be intercepted with two Counterfeited Letters; one to the Pope, subscribed by *Ignatius*, and the other under the Pope's Name to *Photius*. Whence he took occasion to impeach *Ignatius* for keeping Correspondence in the West, and writing thither against the Emperor. Whereupon *Ignatius* was apprehended, who remained in Custody, till the Letter-bearer was manifestly proved to be an Ill Man, and an Impostor. After this he had some Respite; till *Bardas*, frightened by a Dream, in which he saw the Patriarch imploring the Pope's Assistance against him, kept him under so strict a Guard, that he could not so much as say Mass, or speak to any Man. At last *Bardas* was slain, in April, Anno 866. by the Emperor's Order, who set up *Basilius Caesar* in his Place the 26th. following, being *Whitsunday*.

Photius, resolved to be revenged of the Pope, exasperated as much as in him lay the Emperor against him, and persuaded him to call a Council, in order to condemn the Pope, as the Pope had condemned him. He summoned to *Constantinople* all the Bishops of his Patriarchate, and set up others, who pretended themselves to be sent as Deputies from the other Patriarchs. Pope *Nicholas* was accused before this Council, his Deposition pronounced, and his Person excommunicated. This done, *Photius* solicited the Emperor *Lewis* King of *Italy*, and the Prince *Ingelberg*, to declare themselves against the Pope, promising to procure him the Imperial Crown of the East, should they but expel that Pope from his See. The Acts of this Council he sent into the West by *Zachary*. But, soon after this, *Michael* the Emperor was slain by *Basilius's* Order, who thereupon was declared Emperor, Sept. 23d. 867.

The first Thing *Basilius* did, after he had settled himself upon the Throne, was the Expulsion of *Photius*, and Restoration of *Ignatius*. He sent Orders for *Zachary* to return, banished *Photius* into a Monastery, sent for *Ignatius* to *Constantinople*, and reinstated him in his See, Novemb. 23d. in the same Year.

This is observable in the Life of this Patriarch, that he came now into his Church, whilst the Priest offering the Sacrifice, was singing these Words in the Quire, *Giving Thanks unto the Lord*. *Ignatius* being in Possession of his See, excommunicated presently *Photius*, those that had been ordained by him, all his Followers, and such as held Communion with him. He likewise begged of the Emperor, that he would summon a General Council to remedy those Evils the Church did lie under. And several Deputies were immediately dispatched to the Pope at *Rome*; *John*, Bishop of *Pergos*, from *Ignatius*; *Peter* of *Sardis* from *Photius*; and an Officer, named *Basilius*, from the Emperor. *Peter* of *Sardis* perished by a Ship-wreck, in the Gulf of *Dalmatia*; the other two had better Luck, and came safe to *Rome*; where they found Pope *Nicholas* dead, and *Adrian* raised into his Place, who received them very graciously. They shewed him the Acts of the Councils held by *Photius* against *Ignatius*, and Pope *Nicholas* I. *Adrian* called a Synod, which condemned them to be burnt, and excommunicated *Photius* a second time. Next he presented to them two Bishops, by name *Donatus* and *Stephen*, for his Legates, to act in his Name in the Council to be held at *Constantinople*.

This Council was summoned by *Basilius* the Emperor in the third Year of his Reign, and the second of that of *Constantine* Ind. 3. Anno 869. of the Common Account. They met in the Church of *St. Sophia*, on the right side, where the Catechumeni were commonly instructed. In the midst of the Assembly were placed the Holy Gospels, with a Cross. It began the fifth of October, and ended the last day of February following. During which time they had ten distinct Sessions. As to the Number of Bishops assisting thereat, it vary'd very much. At first it consisted only of the Pope's Legates, viz. *Donatus* Bishop of *Ostia*, *Stephen* Bishop of *Nepi*, and *Marinus* a Deacon, *Thomas* Archbishop of *Tyre* representing the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, and *Ignatius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*. With them did 12 Bishops sit, by their Order, who had firmly adhered to *Ignatius's* Cause and Interest. In the second Session they admitted ten Bishops, who begged Pardon for having sided with *Photius*. The third consisted only of 23 Bishops, and the fourth of 21. In the fifth there were two Metropolitans, to wit, of *Ephesus* and *Cyzicum*, who had not been in the former; but on the other side some of the Bishops that had been in the former, did not appear in this. The sixth consisted of thirty seven Bishops, their Number increasing as the Bishops that had stood for *Photius* came in and subscribed a Writing, whereby they rejected him, and owned *Ignatius*. The next two were not more numerous. But the ninth, at which *Joseph* was present, as a Deputy from the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, was composed of above 60 Bishops; and the last of above 100 who all subscribed to the Decisions of the Council. At all their Sitzings there were Senators, Noblemen, and Officers of the Emperor, with *Bahanes* at the Head of them, who spoke to the Bishops in the Name of all. The Emperor was there in Person at the sixth, seventh and eighth Sessions. *Constantine* came thither with him at the ninth, at which were present also *Anastasius* the Library-Keeper, and *Eberard*, as Ambassadors from *Lewis* Emperor of *Italy*, besides two Ambassadors from the King of *Bulgaria*. Almost all the Bishops were of *Asia*, *Thracia* and *Greece*.

The first time they sat was October the 5th. The Pope's Legates, *Ignatius* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, a Deputy from the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, *Thomas*, Metropolitan of *Tyre*, representing the Patriarch of *Antioch*, that See being then vacant; and the Noblemen being met, they sent for the Bishops in, who had been persecuted for the Cause of *Ignatius*, being 12 in Number, viz. Five Metropolitans of *Greece*, and Seven Bishops, who accordingly took their Places in the Council. Then *Bahanes*, the Chief of the Noblemen, read aloud the Emperor's Exhortation to the Council; wherein he declared, that having purposed to put an End to the Differences that troubled the Peace of the Church,

Church, he had sent for Legates from the Bishop of Rome, and Deputies from the other Patriarchs, to hold an Oecumenical Council; that he exhorted the Bishops to come with a Spirit of Peace, and to seek out Remedies for the present Evils. Whereupon *Babanes*, turning to the Pope's Legates, desired them, in the Bishop's Name, to declare unto them whence they came, and what Power they had. They answered, that it was never done before in any Synod, to examine the Power of the Pope's Legates. To which *Babanes* reply'd, that what he did was not for want of Respect to the Holy Apostolick See; but because the late Legates *Radoaldus* and *Zachary* had deceived them, by abusing their Power. This Reason being allowed of, they presented the Pope's Letter to the Emperor; which was read in Latin by *Marinus* the Deacon, one of the Legates, and turned into Greek by *Damian* a Clergyman, the Emperor's Interpreter. In this Letter *Adrian*, having congratulated *Basilus*, concerning his Elevation to the Imperial Throne, commends his Design of restoring Peace to the Church, and his Application to the Holy See to find out a Remedy for the Evils the Church of *Constantinople* did lie under: He approves of what he had done in the behalf of *Ignatius*, and against *Photius*; and returns him his Thanks for his proceeding in that Matter, according to the Judgment of the Holy See, and the Modern Bishops. As to those Bishops, and other Persons, that had troubled the Peace of the Church, and continued to hold Communion with *Photius*, after his Condemnation, he says, they ought to be differently used according to the Difference of their Faults, which he leaves to the Judgment of his Legates and *Ignatius*. And, whereas the Emperor had desired, they should not be proceeded against to the utmost Rigour; he tells the Emperor, that he is very much concerned at it, because not only by the Judgment of *Nicholas* his Predecessor, which he has subscribed to, but also by the Laws of the Church, they ought to be most severely punished, without any hopes of their Restoration. However, for Peace-sake, and to save a great many Men, his Opinion was that Moderation might be used, and some Favour may be shewed them, as has been practised on the like occasions by the Pope's Predecessors, of which he gives some particular Instances. That therefore he desires the Meeting of a Council, wherein his Legates shall preside; who, upon their Knowledge of the Persons and their Faults, may be competent Judges thereof. That a Declaration of Abhorrency shall be made against the Council held against the Holy See, and all the Acts thereof shall be burnt.

He likewise exhorts the Emperor to make all the Bishops subscribe to the Decrees made in the Synod of Rome against *Photius*, and for *Ignatius*. In conclusion, he prays him to send him back four Monks, fled from Italy into *Constantinople*; and recommends unto him his Legates, together with *John* Bishop of *Silea*, *Ignatius* his Deputy, and *Basilus* his Envoy. He prays him to excuse their long Tarrying, as being none of their Fault; for he could not possibly dispatch them sooner, having upon him the Care of so many Churches.

This Letter being read, the Deputies of the other Patriarchs were likewise desired to read their Letters, that Information might be had both of their Qualities and Power. *Elias*, Deputy of the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*, said, they could not be ignorant who they were, and that they might know it by the Emperor's Exhortation; However, to satisfy the Desire of the Assembly, he declared, that *Thomas* Bishop of *Tyre* represented the Patriarch of *Antioch*, during the Vacancy of that See, being the first Metropolitan of that Patriarchate, and consequently had no occasion to bring Recommendatory Letters; and that he spoke for him, because he could not speak Greek without some Difficulty. As for himself, that he had a Letter from *Theodosius* his Patriarch to *Ignatius*, which had been already read, and might be read again. The Contents of which Letter were, that he durst not before write unto him; or send any body to him, for fear of incurring the Suspicion and Persecution of the Prince of the *Saracens*, whom *Jerusalem* was their subject to, and who treated the Christians with a great deal of Humanity, suffering them to build Churches, and to have a free Exercise of their Religion, without any Violence or Hardship put upon them; but, that having receiv'd his Orders to write to him, he sends him *Elias* to represent his Person, a Man of eminent Parts, able to give a sound Judgment of things under debate; that the Prince of the *Saracens* appointed *Thomas* Bishop of *Tyre* to bear him Company; and that he desires him to obtain from the Emperor the Liberty of some *Saracens* who were his Prisoners, whereby the *Saracens* Anger might be appeased, who otherwise threatened the Christians.

Then was read the Paper sent by the Pope to be subscribed by all the Bishops, containing an Excommunication of all Hereticks, particularly of *Photius*, and all the Opposers of Image-worship, with a general Approbation of all the Proceedings against *Photius*, and *Gregory* Bishop of *Syracuse*, by the Popes *Nicholas* and *Adrian*, a Condemnation of all that had been done by *Photius* against the Holy See; and lastly, an Acknowledgment of *Ignatius* as the lawful

Patriarch. This Form was approved of by all the Bishops, and the Deputies from the East. *Thomas* and *Elias* said, they agreed to it, and desired to hear it read. The like Form was drawn up at *Constantinople*, before the Legates came thither, and contained six Articles. In the first, they acknowledge *Ignatius* as the lawful Patriarch. In the second they declare, that all the Bishops who had stood by *Ignatius*, and therefore deposed by *Photius*, ought to be restored to their respective Sees. In the third, they give it, as their Opinion, that all Priests, or other Clerks ordained by *Methodius*, or *Photius*, who joyned with *Photius*, and are returned into the Church since his Expulsion, may be admitted and restored, after they have performed such Penances as shall be laid upon them. In the fourth, they declare *Photius* degraded from his Sacerdotal Office, and incapable of Restoration, and do farther anathematize him, in case he do not submit to the Pope's and their Judgment. In the fifth, they declare *Gregory*, Bishop of *Syracuse*, condemned and deposed, and all that have been ordained by *Photius* unworthy of the Sacerdotal Office. In the last, they recommend the Execution of these Things, declaring they have, in all Points, conformed themselves to the Judgment of Pope *Nicholas*, and excommunicating all Persons that do not submit to his and their Judgment: Which Articles were approv'd of by the Pope's Legates, and the whole Assembly in Council: Whereupon the Pope's Legates, and the Deputies from the Patriarchs of the East, being asked by the Commissioners, why they had condemned *Photius* in his Absence; they gave their Reasons why they refused either to see or hear him, together with the Reasons which had induced them to own *Ignatius*, whom all the Patriarchal Churches had acknowledged to be the Right Patriarch. This done, the Session concluded with Acclamations for the Emperor, the Empress, and the Patriarchs.

In the second Session, the Pope's Legates, *Thomas* of *Tyre*, *Elias* the Deputy from *Jerusalem*, and the twelve Bishops that had firmly adhered to *Ignatius*, being met with the Emperor's Commissioners, *Paul*, the Keeper of the Records of the Church of *Constantinople*, said, that the Bishops that had stood for *Photius* pray'd to be admitted: Which being granted, they declared, that they had been ordained by *Methodius*, or by *Ignatius*; acknowledged their Error in siding with *Photius*, begged Pardon for the same, and presented a Petition, the Substance whereof is as followeth. That having been drawn in by the Artifices of *Photius*, or prevailed upon by the Fear of Persecution; and the Punishments he had threaten'd them with, and inflicted upon *Ignatius*'s Friends, they had been forced to own and support him; that they acknowledged their Fault, and begged Pardon for it; protesting, they should never adhere to *Photius*, or any of his Party, as long as they should continue in their Obstinacy. This Petition of theirs being presented, the Pope's Legates declared, that they received them. The Form was read unto them; who, having approved of, and subscribed unto it, their Petition being laid upon the Gospel and the Cross, they presented it to *Ignatius* the Patriarch, who restored unto them their Pontifical Habit, and then they took their Places in the Council: Though the Number of the Bishops be not expressly mention'd, yet ten of them are named in this Session.

The Priests ordained by *Methodius* and *Ignatius*, who had sided with *Photius*, were likewise admitted; who, having presented a Petition to the same purpose as the former, and subscribed to the Form, were also restored. The same was done with the Deacons, Subdeacons, and other Clerks, these Penances being inflicted upon them all. That they that eat Flesh, should forbear it, together with Eggs and Cheese; and they that eat no Flesh, should abstain from Eggs, Cheese, and Fish, on *Wednesdays* and *Fridays*, and eat nothing but Pulse with Oyl, and a little Wine; to fall upon their Knees fifty times a day; to say a hundred times *Kyrie eleison, My God, I have sinned, forgive my Sin, O Lord*; to repeat the sixth, thirty sixth, and fiftieth Psalms, until *Christmas-day*; and to forbear, till that day, all Sacerdotal Function. Thus ended this Session, with the usual Acclamations.

In the third Session, which was held on the 11th. of October, the Pope's Legates, the Deputies from the East, the Commissioners, and 23 Bishops being met together, the Archbishops of *Ancyra* and *Nice*, who had been ordained by *Ignatius* and *Methodius*, and had favoured *Photius*, were summoned to subscribe unto the Form, in order to be restored. But they declared, that having sufficiently suffered, for having formerly subscribed, whether to good or ill purpose, they were resolved to subscribe only to the Profession of Faith they had subscribed unto when they were ordained, and pray'd the Council to be satisfy'd with their Resolution. After this, the Emperor's Letter to Pope *Nicholas* was read, wherein he signify'd unto him the Deposing of *Photius*, and intreated him to let him know, how he should deal with those who had espoused his Quarrel, or had been ordained by him, expressing his Desire, that they should be pardoned who came in first to acknowledge their Fault. He gave him Notice withal, that he sent Deputies

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

from *Ignatius* and *Photius*, with *Basilins* one of his Gentlemen-Officers, that he may order Things in their Presence as he shall think most expedient, or send them back with Commissioners from him, that he may know his clear Intention.

This Letter was followed by another from *Ignatius* to the same Pope; in which, having extolled the Holy Apostolick See, and commended the Emperor's Zeal, he says, that he sends him a Metropolitan and a Bishop, to express his thankful Acknowledgment, to give him a faithful Account of all Passages, and know of him what Measures he must take in the present Juncture, concerning the Bishops of *Photius's* Faction; whom he divides into two Classes, viz. those ordained by himself, and those ordained by *Photius*. He puts amongst these *Paul* Bishop of *Cæsarea* in *Cappadocia*, who opposed him at first, but afterwards returned to his Duty. With this Letter was read Pope *Adrian's* Answer, in which this Pope having promised *Ignatius* the Patriarch, that his Affection for him shall not fall short of his Predecessor's, and praised God for his Restoration; he gives him, for a Standard, the Decree given by Pope *Nicholas* against *Photius* and *Gregory*; and, confirming the same, declares them degraded of all Sacerdotal Offices, and not to be regarded as Bishops, no more than *Gregory* and *Photius*, who took upon him a Power he had not; *Gregorium Syracusanum & Photium Tyrannum, & eos quos idem Photius in Gratia quolibet ordinasse putatus est, ab Episcoporum numero, vel dignitate, quam usurpative ac fecte habuit, merito sequestrantes*. To prove *Photius's* Ordinations to be void, he gives those following Reasons. First, because *Photius* was like *Maximus*, and his Ordination, or rather Intrusion, in all points like unto his. Secondly, because Pope *Nicholas* his Predecessor had so decreed it. Thirdly, because *Photius* being a Great Man, a Courtier, a Novice, an Intruder, an Adulterer, Excommunicated, having no lawful Power, could not consequently confer it upon his Followers. A Maxim which he afterwards confirms, as owned by *Photius*, and those of his Party. He therefore requires that the same Rigour be used, with relation to those who had been ordained by *Photius*, and even to *Paul* himself, who was recommended unto him by *Ignatius*, who (says he) must expect an everlasting Reward for the Persecution he had suffer'd, besides the temporal Rewards of the Church, and the Honour he has acquired by his Sufferings. As to those who had been ordained by *Methodius*, or *Ignatius*, he commends the Zeal of those who had withstood *Photius*, and suffer'd constantly for the Cause of *Ignatius*; but, for the rest, who submitted to *Photius*, either of their own accord, or by Force, he declares, that, provided they come in, and sign the Form he sends by his Legates, they ought to be pardon'd, and left in Possession of their Church-Dignities, notwithstanding their Opposition against the Patriarchal Dignity, and the Holy Catholick See. Yet he declares withal, that those who assisted at the Illegal Council held at *Constantinople* against the Holy See, should be incapable of Pardon, were not the Compassion of the Holy See invaded by them as great as their Demerit. He exhorts *Ignatius* to see the Articles drawn up at *Rome*, against *Photius* and his Council subscribed unto. Lastly, he commends *John of Silea's* Charity and Zeal for *Ignatius*. This Letter being read, was highly commended by all the Bishops, and so this Session ended with the usual Acclamations.

The fourth Session was held *Octob. 13th*. In which two Bishops were accused, *Theophilus* and *Zachary* by Name, who were both ordained by *Methodius*, and continued obstinate in *Photius's* Party. These Bishops being called into the Council, required that the other Bishops that stood it out for *Photius* should also be called in. There was some Time a Debate upon the Matter, whether or no they should be admitted. But the Pope's Legates did at last consent, that three of them should be called in, in the Name of the rest, to hear the Sentence passed against them. When they were to be called in, they had all withdrawn themselves, except *Theophilus* and *Zachary*, who being come before the Council, maintained, that Pope *Nicholas* had communicated with them. The Legates convinced them of Falshood, by *Nicholas's* Letter against *Photius*, which they caused to be read. *Thomas* and *Elias* made it appear likewise, that they had never owned *Photius* for a Patriarch. Which appearing undeniable, *Theophilus* and *Zachary* were pressed upon to subscribe to the Form against *Photius*. But they would not so much as hear of it, and so were turned out of the Council. This is the Sum of what passed in this Session.

In the fifth, held *Octob. 20th*. *Paul*, the Emperor's Charter-Keeper, had ordered *Photius* to be brought before the Council. Some Laymen being sent to know of him, Whether he was willing to appear? He answer'd, that he came not willingly, but was carry'd by Force. The Bishops however order'd, that he should come in. He protested against it, refused to answer the Questions made unto him, and would, by no means, acknowledge his Fault. Pope *Nicholas's* Letters, containing the Sentence passed against him, were read, and the Deputy of the Church of *Jerusalem* protested again, that the Patriarchs of the East had never owned him, ex-

horting him to do Penance. This done, the Pope's Legates declared him excommunicated; and the Council did approve of it. He was exhorted to do Penance, and to acknowledge his Fault, there being no Refuge left for him, now that *Rome* and the *East* had declared against him. To which he answer'd, that his Plea was not of this World. He was again warned to think seriously of his Case, and had Time given him for it.

The Emperor himself was present at the sixth Session, which was held *Octob. 25th*. *Metrophanes*, Metropolitan of *Syria*, made him a Compliment. After which a Memoir of the Pope's Legates was read, containing the Substance of what had passed against *Photius*. Then were called in the Bishops ordained by *Photius*, and Pope *Nicholas's* Letter to *Michael* the Emperor was read. Upon which the Council told them, that they ought to forsake *Photius*, and submit to their Judgment, who had declared his Ordinations void. They endeavour'd to defend *Photius's* Ordination, and their own, against the Decree of Pope *Nicholas*, by some Instances of Bishops condemned or rejected by the Popes, who, notwithstanding, were owned to be lawful. To which the Emperor himself gave this Answer; that those Bishops had been owned and defended by other Patriarchal Sees, whereas *Photius* was forsaken by all; that he pitied their Case, and exhorted them to submit themselves to the Mercy of the Council. The Pope's Legates told them, that if they would subscribe to the Form, and do Penance, they should be received into the Church-Communion; and, at the same time, answered to the Instances by them alledged, to shew, that the Pope's Decisions concerning condemned Persons, had not been always followed. After this, the Emperor caused a long Exhortation to be read, directed to those who were of *Photius's* Faction, whereby they were exhorted to submit themselves, and had seven days time to consider of it.

The seventh Session was held *Octob. 29th*. in the Presence of the Emperor. The Time allowed to *Photius*, to consider what he would do, being elapsed, he was called in, with *Gregory* Bishop of *Syracuse*. *Marinus* the Deacon, one of the Legates, caused his Crosier to be taken away from him; and the rest of them advised him to subscribe unto the Form, that he might be received as a Layman, into the Church-Communion. Instead of returning them an Answer, he directed his Speech to the Emperor, wished him a long Life, and declared he had no Answer to give to the Legates. Being asked by *Babanes*, Whether he had any thing else to say? He answer'd, that Question might have been spared, had they but minded what he had told them a few days since, and that he exhorted them to do Penance themselves. The Council was incensed at this Answer of *Photius*; whereupon the Bishops ordained by him, or who adhered still to him, were immediately called in, and the Form brought from *Rome* offered unto them to set their Hands to it. But all the Arguments which the Bishops and the Emperor himself did make, to induce them to it, proved insignificant. Pope *Nicholas's* Letter to the Bishops of the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, and the Clergy of that City, containing the Sentence passed against *Photius* and his Adherents, was read unto them; together with *Adrian's* Letters to the Emperor, to *Ignatius* the Patriarch, and the Acts of the Synod held at *Rome*, under that Pope against *Photius*, in the Presence of the Deputies sent from *Constantinople*. Which Acts begin with three Discourses of the Pope to the Council; the first containing a compendious History of the Intrusion and Attempts of *Photius*. In the second, the Pope requires the Condemnation of the Acts of the pretended Council of *Photius* against the Holy See. And the third contains a Complaint of his Presumption, in passing a Judgment against the Pope, whom he pretends to be liable to the Judgment of no Man, which he proves by the Instance of *Symmachus*: And, in Answer to the Example of *Honorius*, who was anathematiz'd by the Eastern Bishops after his Death; He says, That he was accused of Heresy; for which Cause only 'tis lawful for Inferiors to resist their Superiors, and forsake their Errors; and that neither the Patriarchs, nor Bishops, could have set up for his Judges, if the then Bishop of *Rome*, as first Bishop, had not himself consented to it. To which he adds, that the Council of *Ephesus* had censured and condemned *John* of *Antioch*, for his attempting to pass Judgment against St. *Cyril* Patriarch of *Alexandria*, whose See precedes that of *Antioch*. Which Maxim was approved of, and confirmed by this Council, praying the Pope to pardon those who should acknowledge their Fault, and return to their Duty, and to regulate that Matter in the Presence of the Deputies sent from *Constantinople*. Upon which the Pope declared, that all the Acts of the Council held by *Photius* against the Authority of the Holy See, ought to be utterly destroyed, and thrown into the Fire; that all the Assemblies he held against *Ignatius* ought likewise to be had in detestation; that he reiterates and confirms the Sentence passed against him by his Predecessor, yet willing to admit him, as a Layman, into the Church-Communion, if he will but consent to all the Proceedings of the Holy See against him, and condemn his own

Of the
Contest
betwixt
Photius
and
Ignatius.

own against his Predecessor ; That he grants Communion to all such as have given their Consent or Approbation to that Council, provided they approve of what was done by the Holy See. And, whereas the Name of *Basilus* the Emperor is put into the Acts, he declares, That it was falsely put in, being assured, that Prince had always had a great Respect for the Holy See ; for which Reason he declares him a most Orthodox and Religious Prince. Lastly, That he excommunicates all Persons that shall in time to come adhere to, or approve of the Acts of that Council, and that shall not approve of the Decrees of the Holy See : This Judgment was signed by more than thirty Bishops of *Italy*, nine Cardinal-Priests, the Archdeacon of *Rome*, and four Deacons.

These Acts of the *Roman Synod* being read over in the Council of *Constantinople*, *Nicetas* said, That, seeing *Photius* refused to submit, he thought it fit that the Excommunication pronounced against him should be reiterated. *Ignatius* the Patriarch having made a Speech thereupon to the Council, *Stephen*, Deacon and Notary, pronounced several times the Anathema against *Photius*, and made several Acclamations to the Prosperity of the Emperor, the Empress, the Pope, and the Patriarchs Deputies.

The eighth Session was held upon the 8th. day of *November*; the Acts of the Council of *Photius* against Pope *Nicholas* being first burnt by the Emperor's Order. There appeared three Persons bearing such Names as *Photius* had given to the pretended Deputies from the Pope and the Patriarchs, who declared, That they had not subscribed to those Acts, and knew not what they were about. Being pressed to pronounce an Anathema against those that had subscribed thereunto, they did it. This done, one *Theodorus Eribimius*, an *Iconoclast*, being summoned to appear at the Council, was called in. The Emperor pressing him to own the Lawfulness of Image-worship, to convince him thereof, asked him, Whether he honoured his Image upon a Medal ? He protested, That he had for it all the Respect and Veneration which he ought to have. If then, said the Emperor, you respect the Image of a Mortal Man, much more ought you to honour the Image of Christ, of the Virgin, and the Saints. *Theodorus* being puzzled with this Objection, desired Time, but he was pressed to declare. The Decree of Pope *Nicholas*, relating to Images, was read to him, yet he refused to yield. Three others, *Iconoclasts*, acknowledged their Error, and pronounced an Anathema against all such Persons as should refuse to honour Images. *Theodorus*, and all other *Iconoclasts*, were anathematized by the Council, which repeated again their Excommunication against *Photius* and *Gregory*. And so ended this Session, with the usual Acclamations.

The ninth Session was held *Feb. 12th.* in the Year following. There was admitted a Deputy from the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, who brought a Credential Letter from him to the Emperor ; in which he signify'd, that he could not give his Judgment in the Difference betwixt the two Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, because by Reason of his Remoteness he had no certain Information of it ; that the Bishops, and other Clergymen, under that Patriarchate, were the more proper Judges ; that there were formerly two Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, when *Narcissus* having withdrawn himself into the Wilderness, another Patriarch was ordained in his Place ; that *Narcissus* being returned, he ruled some Time with him, after whose Decease, *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, was chosen to govern together with *Narcissus* the Church of *Alexandria*. After the Reading of this Letter, this Deputy (named *Joseph*) was admitted as Vicar of the Patriarch of *Alexandria* ; and was asked, Whether he was informed of what related to the Ordination of *Ignatius*, and the Deposition of *Photius* ? His Answer was, That he was not only informed of the Matter, but had himself examined all Passages relating to it, and approved of the same ; and, to assure the Council of it, he tendered a Writing, which was read in full Council ; whereby he formerly declared his Opinion in the Thing. Next, the Witnesses were called in, who had appeared against *Ignatius* in the Synod held before *Zachary* and *Radoaldus*. One of them, called *Theodorus*, was examined first of all ; who confessed, That he had been forced by an express Order of *Michael* the Emperor, to swear falsely, and to depose against the Ordination of *Ignatius* ; that he had confessed his Fault to an Abbot, who had therefore imposed upon him a Penance, which he had performed. But being ask'd, Whether the Party who had laid that Penance upon him was a Priest, or not ? He answer'd, He knew nothing on't ; but that he was an Abbot, and had great Confidence in him. In short, he owned this Council to be lawful. Another Witness, named *Leo*, did also averr, That he had falsely deposed against the Ordination of *Ignatius*. Being asked, Whether he had done Penance for his Fault ? He answered, He had not ; but, if any were laid upon him, he would submit to it : Declaring, That he owned this Council to be lawful. But being ask'd, Whether he did anathematize *Photius*, and all those against whom the Council had pronounced an Anathema ? Who am I, says he, to pronounce an Anathema ? This is only done, adds he,

in Case of Heresie, whereas *Photius* is Orthodox. Wherefore, says he, should I then anathematize him ? The Patriarchs Legates answer'd, That his Actions were worse than Heresie it self. Upon which *Leo* did anathematize him, and all those whom the Council had anathematiz'd, when he saw that it might be done for other Causes than Heresie. Eleven Witnesses more were examin'd, who all confessed, They had been compelled to bear false Witness against *Ignatius*. Some of them had done Penance for it, and those who had not, received it from the Council. As to the other False Witnesses then absent, they had a general Penance laid upon them, To be two Years out of the Church, two Years with the Hearers without receiving the Communion, and to abstain from Flesh and Wine during these four Years, except *Sundays* and Holy-days ; to stand up three Years with the Faithful, performing three times a Week the like Abstinence ; and were declared excommunicated, unless they came to acknowledge their Fault, and submit to that Penance. 'Tis true, the Council left it to *Ignatius* the Patriarch, to moderate, as he should think fit, the Rigour of the Penance.

After this another Business was brought in before the Council, relating to some Officers of *Michael* the Emperor, who had took upon them to wear the Sacerdotal Habit, and to perform the Office of a Priest ; one named *Theophilus*, the Emperor's Master of Horse, having laid the Gospels upon their Heads, and said Prayers in Derision of Ordination. *Theophilus* was dead ; but three of those Officers were found guilty of this Sacrilege : Who being brought before the Council, the Patriarchs Legates obliged them to confess their Crime, the Enormity whereof they exposed unto them ; and they freely submitted to what Penance should be laid upon them. Lastly, The false Deputies of the Patriarchs, whose Names *Photius* had put in the Acts of his Council, were examined before the Deputy of the Patriarch of *Alexandria*.

In the tenth Session, at which assisted both the Emperors, the last day of *February*, the Canons were read that were to be authorized by this Council.

The 1st. confirms the Canons and Rules set down by the Apostles, by the general and particular Councils, and by the Holy Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

The second exacts a due Observation and Execution of what had been decreed by the Popes *Nicholas* and *Adrian*, upon Pain of Deposition of Clerks, Delinquents, and Excommunication of Laymen.

The 3d. requires the same Adoration to our Saviour's Image, as to the Book of the Gospels ; because, as our Salvation is obtained by the Words contained in that Holy Book ; so in Images, we learn by the Features and Colours, what the Scripture teaches by the Letters ; and therefore they ought to be honoured according to ancient Tradition, with Worship relating to the Original ; and as we honour the Gospel, and the Figure of the Cross, so ought we to honour the Virgin *Mary's*, and the Saints Images. This Canon ends with an Anathema against such as shall not do it.

In the 4th. Canon, the Council condemns *Photius*, and declares, That he never was a Bishop ; That those ordained, or raised to any Church-Dignity by him, shall be degraded ; that the Churches consecrated by him, or those whom he had ordained, shall be consecrated anew ; and that all the former Acts of his Sacerdotal Functions shall be null.

By the 5th. 'tis prohibited to ordain a Man, who leaves the World and turns Monk, in order to become a Bishop, or Patriarch, though he has continued some considerable Time in each Degree of the Orders. And as to those who left the Secular Life without any such Ambition, it is ordained, That none shall be raised to that Dignity, till they have been Readers the Space of one Year, Subdeacons two Years, Deacons three, and Priests four Years. A Time not requisite to observe, in respect of those that have been, from the very first, Clerks or Monks.

The 6th. pronounces an Anathema against *Photius*, for having intruded false Deputies, and against all those who shall hereafter impose thus upon the Publick.

By the 7th. it is prohibited to suffer any Person, condemned by this Council, to paint Images, or teach in the Churches.

The 8th. contains a Prohibition to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, to exact Declaratory Subscriptions from Bishops, that they shall own him for their Patriarch.

By the 9th. it is determined, That those who have thus subscribed for *Photius*, are not bound to stand to it.

By the 10th. it is prohibited to separate from the Patriarch's Communion, or to refuse to name him in the Celebration of the Holy Mysteries, before he has been condemned in a Council, how conspicuous soever be his Crimes : Which extends likewise to Bishops, in relation to their Metropolitans, as it does to these in relation to their Patriarch.

The 11th. pronounces an Anathema against such as hold, That Man has two Souls.

The 12th. doth enjoin the Deposition of Bishops, that shall prove to have been chosen by the Intrigues or Violence of Princes.

By the 13th. it is order'd, That the principal Dignities of the Church of *Constantinople* shall be conferred upon such Clerks of that Church, as have served in lesser Offices, and not to Strangers, or Persons having Secular Employments. The 14th. provides for the Honour of Episcopacy, by enjoying the Bishops not to meet great Men and Princes at a Distance from their Churches, or to light when they meet them, or to prostrate themselves before them.

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

The 15th. prohibits all Bishops, upon Pain of being deposed, to sell, or alienate what belongs to their Churches, and pronounces an Anathema against the Purchasers or Retainers thereof. If a Bishop erects a Monastery out of his Church-Revenues, he ought to leave it to the Church. But if it be out of his own Revenues, he may dispose of it; provided nevertheless, that it shall not become a Place of Habitation for Laymen.

The 16th. is to prevent the Impiety of such as take upon them, in Derision, the Priestly Habit: Which Sacrilege is strictly forbidden by this Council, enjoying, That if any Emperor, or Prince, should attempt for the Future to do any such Thing, he shall be therefore liable to a Penance, and anathematized, if he refuse to submit to it: And if the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, or his Suffragan Bishops, should wink at it, they shall be deposed; and that all those who shall prove to have been any ways instrumental in such an Impiety, shall do Penance, and be excluded during the Space of three Years, from the Communion of the Church, viz. one Year in each Degree of publick Penance.

The 17th. renewing the sixth Canon of the *Nicene* Council, concerning the Rights and Prerogatives of the Patriarchs, declares, That both at *Rome*, and in the Patriarchates of *Antioch* and *Jerusalem*, the Patriarchs shall be impowered to summon to their Councils all the Metropolitans whom they ordain or confirm, by giving them the *Pallium*, and likewise to reprove and correct them. That it shall be no lawful Excuse for the Metropolitans to alledge, That their Princes will not give them Leave to go out of their Dominions, or that they are bound to hold a Synod twice a Year, because they ought to perform the Good of a whole Diocese, that is, of several Provinces, procured by a Patriarchal Synod before that of one Province. That it is needless for Princes to be present at those Synods, because it does not appear, that they have assisted at any but General Councils. It is therefore ordered by this Council, That the Metropolitans which are summoned by their Patriarch, and shall not appear two Months after his Summons, shall be excluded from Church-Communion, and deposed, in Case they continue a whole Year in their Obstinacy.

The 18th. doth pronounce an Anathema against all those that shall take away from any Church her Rights or Privileges, obtained by the Grant of Princes, or enjoy'd during thirty Years.

The 19th. prohibits all Metropolitans to remove from their own into other Dioceses, abusing their Authority, to consume the Revenues of the Churches of their Suffragan Bishops. Yet it enjoins, That Hospitality shall be used towards them, when they shall be obliged to go through any Diocese; but that they shall be provided only of such Things as shall be found there; that they shall proceed on their Way, without making any long Stay, or exacting any Thing, either from the Bishop, or Church. For, if all Bishops be bound to use their Revenues with Parsimony, and not spend them for their own Use: How great is their Fault, who impoverish, or burden the Churches of other Bishops?

The 20th. enjoins, That those who are in Possession of Church-Lands, paying Rent for the same, shall not be turned out by Force, and without a due Course of Law, for want of Payment, but shall be summon'd; and, if in three Years Time they pay not what they owe, Application shall be made to the Judges, that by Vertue of a Judgment, the Church may be put into Possession of her Land.

The 21st. declares, That all due Respect must be shewed to Patriarchs, and all Attempts to turn them out of their Sees are unlawful: That the Pope of Old *Rome* ought to be honoured and respected in the first Place, and next to him the Patriarchs of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Jerusalem*. That none ought to attempt to write against the Pope, under Pretence of some Crimes, which they falsely impute to him, as *Photius*, and, before him, *Dioscorus*, have done; that all those, who, in Imitation of them, shall cast any Obloquy, by Word of Mouth, or in Writing, against St. Peter's Holy See, the Prince of the Apostles, shall be condemned, as those two Hereticks are; and that if any Prince attempt to depose him, he shall be excommunicated. But if a General Council being met, there happens any Difference with the Bishop of *Rome*, he ought to be conferred with about the Matter, and his Answers be had, to make the best of it on either side, and no rash Judgment to be passed against the Supreme Bishop.

By the 22^d. it is ordered, That Princes and great Men shall have no Hand in the Election of Patriarchs, Metropolitans, or Bishops, but shall receive him whom the Bishops have chosen. Yet if any Layman be invited to join his Assistance in the Election, he may lawfully do it.

The 23^d. charges the Bishops not to give away what belongs to other Churches; nor to ordain those Men Priests or Clerks in Churches, that have no Dependency upon them, nor to perform their Functions in any other Dioceses, without the Leave of the Bishop of the Place.

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

The 24th. is against the Metropolitans, that send for their Suffragan Bishops to perform their Functions, while they are taken up with Secular Employments. The Patriarch is ordered to punish them; and, if they persist in their Delinquency, to depose them.

The 25th. declares, That all Bishops and Priests, Deacons and Subdeacons, ordained by *Ignatius*, or *Methodius*, who still adhere to *Photius*, shall be deposed, and made incapable for ever of all Sacerdotal Functions; but, if they repent hereafter, they shall be received into the Church-Communion, but not restored to their Dignity.

The 26th. allows the Freedom to any Priest or Deacon, deposed by his Bishop, to appeal to his Metropolitan; who shall send for the Bishop, and examine the Clerk's Case in a Synod, in order to confirm or annul the Judgment given against him. It gives likewise to Bishops, judged by their Metropolitans, the Liberty of a Recourse to the Patriarch, as the Judge of the Causes of the Metropolitans within his Patriarchate; and excludes both the Provincial Bishops and the Neighbouring Metropolitans, from taking any Cognizance thereof.

The 27th. being the last of all, enjoins all Bishops to make use of their *Pallium* at proper Times and Places; and not to abuse it through Pride or Ambition, by wearing it at all Times, and using it in all their Functions; and that all such as have been Monks shall keep some Marks of their Profession.

These Canons being read, the Legates proposed, That the Definition of the Council should be read, which contained a Confession of Faith, or a Symbol of a pretty large Extent; an Acknowledgment of the seven first General Councils; the Condemnation of some Hereticks therein condemned; the Condemnation of *Photius*, and the Approbation of what had been enacted in this Council. This Definition being unanimously approved of by all the Bishops, the Emperor asked, Whether any one amongst them had any thing to say against the Canons and Decrees of this eighth General Council, because whoever should oppose them, after the Breaking up of the Assembly, should be condemned to Banishment. At the same Time he exhorted the Bishops to give wholesome Instructions to their Flocks, and all Clergymen to keep Peace amongst them, and not to depart from the Council's Decisions. The Laymen he charged to forbear disputing about Church Matters, the Cognizance whereof belongs to the Patriarchs, Bishops, and Doctors of the Church: Which Exhortations were approved of by all the Bishops. Lastly, The Pope's Legates proposed, That the Acts of this Council should be subscribed unto, and invited the Emperors to do it in the first Place. But *Basilus* answer'd, That he ought not to subscribe, but after the Bishops, in Imitation of *Constantine*; yet, seeing they did him that Honour, he was willing to sign next to the Deputies of the Patriarchs. So *Donatus* Bishop of *Ostia* signed first; next to him the other Deputies from *Rome*, then the Deputies of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, and *Constantinople*; and next to these the Emperors *Basilus*, *Constantine*, and *Leo*; and lastly, all the Bishops, every one according to his Rank. Five several Copies were subscribed unto. The Officers and Noblemen who had assisted at this Council, declared their Abhorrency of all the Actings of *Photius* against Pope *Nicholas* and *Ignatius* the Patriarch; and that they freely submitted to the Decisions of the Council: Which was accordingly recorded by the Registers; and so the Council broke up, with the usual Acclamations.

The Pope's Legates did not subscribe, till after a Review made of all the Acts, by *Anastasius* the Library-Keeper, who was well skill'd in the *Greek* Tongue; who, having observed, that the Commendations given in Pope *Adrian's* Letter, to the Emperor of the West, were razed out, they made a Scruple to subscribe, and complained of it. The *Greeks*, unwilling to own the Emperor of the West, refused to have them inserted; and, to palliate the Matter, alledged, That in a Council, God's Praise only, not the Commendations of Princes, ought to be mentioned. A Pretence not very taking from Persons that continually repeated their Acclamations in Honour of the Emperors. This Debate however obliged the Legates, fearful to do any Thing that might displease the Pope, to subscribe, with this Restriction, that they gave their Consent to the Acts of this Council.

The Council afterwards caused Circular Letters to be drawn, to acquaint the whole World with the Condemnation of *Photius*, and the Restoration of *Ignatius*. One was particularly directed to Pope *Adrian*, full of Thanks and Approbation of the whole Proceedings of the Holy See in this Matter. The Emperors writ likewise two Letters about this Council; one to the Patriarchs, to let them know the Success of their Meeting; and the other to the Pope, full of Thanks and Commendations.

Of the Contest betwixt Photius and Ignatius. Ignatius the Patriarch writ in particular a Letter to Pope Adrian, wherein he prays him to consent, That the Readers ordain'd by Photius might be admitted into Holy Orders, and desired Favour for Paul, the Keeper of the Records of the Church of Constantinople, and for Theodorus Metropolitan of Caria.

Contestations upon Bulgaria. The Council being ended, some Bishops of the Patriarchate of Constantinople went to wait upon the Emperor, and complained, The Church of Constantinople was made too much subject to the Church of Rome; adding, That the Uncertainty that was observed in the Legates Subscriptions, might give Occasion to alter what was passed, and that they could not recover their Liberty, if they did not recover the Forms they were fain to subscribe unto. Whereupon those Forms were taken out of the Hands of those to whom the Legates had committed the Care of them; and they found it exceeding difficult to recover them, though they made use of the Interest of the Ambassadors of the Western Empire, who pressed it so hard upon the Emperor, that he found himself obliged to get them returned into their Hands. Three days after this, the Emperor sent for the Pope's Legates into a Place where Ignatius the Patriarch, and the Deputies of the other Patriarchs were met together. An Envoy of Bulgaria, Peter by Name, was called in; who acquainted the Assembly, That the Prince of Bulgaria was very joyful to learn, that they had met in Council for the Good of the Church; and, that he thanked the Legates of the Holy See of Rome for having writ to him in their Way hither. After these Compliments, he asked the Patriarchs Vicars, in the Name of the Bulgarians, What Church they must be subject to? To which the Pope's Legates answer'd immediately, That the Bulgarians had been first instructed in the Christian Faith by the Church of Rome, which had sent unto them Bishops, and Priests, according to their Desire. The Envoy owned, That it was true, the Bulgarians had first apply'd themselves to the Church of Rome, which they had owned hitherto; but that this was the Time to decide with the Patriarchs Legates, to which of the two Churches it was most reasonable they should submit themselves, the Church of Rome, or that of Constantinople. The Pope's Legates answer'd, They had made an End of those Things they were sent for; and that they could not regulate any Thing farther, or consent to any Regulation prejudicial to the Church of Rome, concerning such Matters as they had no Power to treat of: But, the whole Country of Bulgaria being full of Latin Priests, their Opinion was, That they ought to submit themselves to no Church but that of Rome.

The Deputies of the Patriarchs of the East asked the Bulgarians, Whose Country Bulgaria was, when conquer'd by them? Whether they had, at that Time, Greek or Latin Priests? To which they answer'd, That they conquer'd it from the Greeks, amongst whom they found Greek Bishops. Whence the Patriarchs Deputies inferred, That those Bishops were ordained by the Patriarch of Constantinople. But it was reply'd by the Pope's Legates, That, though they were Greeks, it did not follow, that they were ordained by the Patriarch of Constantinople; that the Difference between Laymen did not make any Confusion in the Ecclesiastical Order; and that the Latin Church had Greeks in several Places who were subject to her. The Deputies of the Patriarchs retorted, They cou'd not deny but that Bulgaria was a Member of the Greek Empire, which the Legates granted; but affirmed withal, That the Division of the Church does not agree therein with that of the Empire. Being asked, Upon what they grounded the Right of the Church of Rome, they answer'd, First, That it was plain by the Decretals of the Bishops of Rome, that the two Epyrus's, Thessaly, and Dardania, to which the Bulgarians gave the Name of Bulgaria, had formerly belonged to the Church of Rome. Secondly, That the Bulgarians had voluntarily submitted themselves to the Holy See. Thirdly, That the Holy See had sent unto them Latin Priests and Bishops, and that they had yet actually a Latin Bishop. That the Right of the Church of Rome being so well grounded, and her Possession so long, she ought not to be deprived of it. The Deputies of the Patriarchs asked them, Upon which of those Pretences they grounded themselves. To which they answer'd, They did not own them for Judges, who were under the Holy See, and that they had no Power to treat of this Matter. Notwithstanding which Protestation, the Deputies of the Patriarchs made this Decision; That it was unreasonable for the Romans, who disowned the Greek Empire, and were confederated with the French, to pretend to a Right of Ordination in their Emperor's Dominions; and therefore their Judgment was, That that Part of Bulgaria which formerly belonged to the Empire, and had received Greek Priests and Bishops, should be restored to the Church of Constantinople. The Pope's Legates on the other side declared, That they made void that pretended Judgment given by the Deputies of the East, and conjured Ignatius the Patriarch to forbear sending Priests or Bishops into Bulgaria; and presented to him, at the same Time, a Letter from Pope Adrian upon that Subject: Which being read by Ignatius, not without

some Reluctancy, he answer'd in general Terms, That he would not engage himself in that Affair.

Of the Contest betwixt Photius and Ignatius. The Emperor, although he was provoked by the Opposition of the Pope's Legates, concealed, for some Time, his Resentment. Having treated them sumptuously, he dismissed them with rich Presents; but took no Care to provide for their Safety, and sent them away without a Convoy. So that they were intercepted by the Slavonians, who seized upon all they had, and, amongst other Things, of the Authentick Acts of the Council. In short, they were very ill treated, and kept some Time in Captivity: But, being at last released, upon pressing Letters from the Pope, and the Western Emperor, they returned to Rome at the latter End of the Year. They gave the Pope an Account of their Voyage, and deliver'd unto him Ignatius's Letter, and some Writings they had recover'd from the Bulgarians, with those they had put into the Hands of Sipho, Minister of State, and Anastasius the Library-keeper, which fell not into the same Danger; but preserved, and brought the Acts of the Council entire to Rome.

Pope Adrian was very well pleased with the Transactions of the late Council, but no less dissatisfied with what had passed since, as he expressed it in the Letter he writ to the Emperor, dated Nov. 10. 871. In which, having praised their Piety and Zeal; he makes great Complaints of their Neglect of his Legates, as to their Safety, being left without a Convoy, to the Mercy of Barbarians, by whom they were stript, made Captives, and very ill used. But that which touches him most to the Quick, is the Business of Bulgaria, complaining of the Attempt made to extort it from the Jurisdiction of the Holy See, and that Ignatius has had the Confidence to ordain a Bishop, in order to send him thither. To which he adds, That, if they continue in that Resolution, he must vindicate his Right, and make void the Ordination of all such as shall perform any Episcopal or Ecclesiastick Functions in that Country by the Mission of the Bishop of Constantinople. As to Ignatius's Requests to him, he declares, That he cannot alter any Thing in that Matter, nor derogate from the Ordinances of his Predecessors; or the Council; for, it was not the Practice of the Popes to abuse, according to their Fancy, the Decrees of their Fathers; as did some Greeks, who used the Pope's Decrees as long as they favoured their Designs, but laid them aside, when they found them contrary.

New Troubles upon the Account of Bulgaria. This however hindred not the Greeks from taking Possession of Bulgaria, and turning out of it the Latin Priests and Bishops. But the Popes did not lose all Hopes to recover it. In order to which, John VIII. next Successor to Adrian, sent in the Year 878. two Legates to Constantinople, viz. Peter and Eugenius; the first, Bishop of Ancona, this of Ostia. The Pretence was, To bring the Church of Constantinople into a peaceable Temper, then still divided by the Faction of Photius. But he charged them to go to the Prince of Bulgaria, and writ, at the same Time, a very positive Letter to Ignatius the Patriarch, the Substance of which was, That he now warned him the third Time to yield up Bulgaria to the Holy See of Rome, and thirty days after the Receipt of this Letter, to call from thence all Bishops, Priests, and other Ecclesiasticks by him ordained. If not, he would exclude him from the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; as long as he persisted to keep that Country under his Jurisdiction; and, if he continued in his Obstinacy, he would declare him deprived and fallen from the Patriarchal Dignity, wherein he had been kept by the Favour of the Holy See. At the same Time the Pope writ two Letters to Michael King of the Bulgarians, exhorting him to submit to the Church of Rome; and required of Count Peter, that he would use his utmost Endeavours to persuade that Prince to it. Lastly, he commanded all Greek Priests and Bishops, then in Bulgaria, to withdraw themselves within the Space of thirty days, declaring them deprived of their Functions, if they refused to do it within that Time.

Photius returns into Constantinople and is restored. Photius, relying upon this Division between the Pope and Ignatius, attempted his Restoration; and, having by his Artifices procured the Emperor's Favour, with the Assistance of Theodorus Santarabenus, he returned to Constantinople, Ignatius yet living. 'Tis said, This Patriarch offer'd him to write in his Behalf to all the Bishops under his Patriarchate, and procure, that he should have his Absolution, provided, he would forbear all Sacerdotal Functions; but Photius refused it, being resolved to attempt his Restoration to the Patriarchal Dignity. Thus, instead of reconciling himself with Ignatius, he declared against him, and ordained in Magnaurus's Palace, Ignatius yet living. But this Patriarch dying, Octob. 23d. 878: Photius went into St. Sophia's Church with armed Men; forcing a great many Bishops, Clerks and Monks, to communicate with him, and to own him as their Patriarch; deposing, and persecuting all that refused; turning out all that had been ordained by Ignatius, and restoring them to their respective Stations, after he had re-ordained them. At the same Time he took Care to confer the principal Dignities of the Church upon his own Creatures. And, to prevent all Opposition on the Papal side,

with Threats and Presents he prevailed with the two Legates, to tell publicly, both the Clergy and People, That they were come to depose *Ignatius*, and to declare *Photius* their Patriarch.

To bring the Holy See to consent to *Photius's* Restoration, *Basilus* the Emperor sent Ambassadors to Pope *John* the VIII. to desire of him, That he would receive *Photius* into his Communion, and own him as Patriarch. Three Monks were also sent to desire the same Thing, in the Name of the Patriarch of *Jerusalem*; and *Photius* sent *Theodorus Santarabenus*, to bring about this Accommodation; who were all well received, and had a favourable Audience from the Pope. The Eastern Emperor, whose Forces began then to be considerable in *Italy*, promised him to secure the Coast of *Campania* from the Irruptions of the *Saracens*, and to yield him up *Bulgaria*. To justify the Restoration of *Photius*, the Necessity of it was urged, for the Good of the Peace, and the Re-union of Mens Minds. To which his Partisans added, That *Ignatius* himself was for it; and a Paper was produced, under his Name, whereby he desired the Pope's Consent to it.

The Pope, in Answer to the Emperor, sent him Word, That *Ignatius* of happy Memory being dead, he consented, by Reason of the present Necessity, and for the Good of the Peace, that *Photius* should be owned as Patriarch, provided that he gave Satisfaction, and begged Pardon before a Council; That he declared him absolved, with all the Churchmen of his Party, from all Censures and Condemnations against them; and that he thought it convenient, to have him re-instated in the See of *Constantinople*; but that he expected, no Layman or Courtier should, for the Future, be raised to the Patriarchal Dignity of *Constantinople*; and that Cardinal-Priests, or Deacons of that Church, should be chosen for that See. To which he added, That he granted this, but on Condition that *Bulgaria* should be resigned up to him, and that the Patriarch of *Constantinople* should make no Claim to it. Lastly, He exhorted the Emperor to own, and bear Respect to the Patriarch, and to endeavour the Re-union of the Bishops, and the whole Clergy with *Photius*; declaring all those excommunicated, That should refuse to hold Communion with him, after three several Notices. This Letter, bearing Date the 16th. of August, 879. was carried by one *Peter*, a Priest, who was sent to *Constantinople*, with the Deputies come from thence. He had also, under his Care, a private Letter to *Photius*, wherein the Pope expressed unto him the Joy he received by the Re-union and Peace of the Church of *Constantinople*, and his Consent to his Restoration, provided that he begged Pardon in a Synod, and restored *Bulgaria* to the Holy See. Other Letters he was charged with, one directed to the Clergy of *Constantinople*; another to the Patriarchs of the East, upon the same Subject; and a third, directed to those who should refuse to hold Communion with *Photius*, wherein he warned them to acknowledge him as their Patriarch; if not, that he had charged his Legate to excommunicate them.

He writ in particular to the two Legates he had sent to *Constantinople*, and let them know he was not satisfy'd with their rash Approving of *Photius*, without his Order or Knowledge; that however he joyned unto them *Peter*, Cardinal-Priest, that they might labour together for the Peace of the Church, according to the Letters and Instructions he had given him. By which Instructions, they were to make their first Visit to the Emperor, and deliver him the Letter they had for him; the next day to visit *Photius*, and give him his Letter, with Salutations from him, and a Declaration of the Command they had received from him, to own him for Peace-sake, as Patriarch, and to make all the Churches own him, provided he received all those that should be willing to hold Communion with him, though his Adversaries before. That a Council should be called, in which they should preside with the Patriarch, and the Deputies of the Patriarchs of the East, and wherein should be present the Metropolitans and Bishops of the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*. In it he order'd, That there should be read his Letter to the Emperor, and the Bishops be asked, Whether they approved of it; which done, they should declare, That the Holy Father having the Care of all the Churches, and being desirous to procure Peace amongst them, had sent them thither to make up their Breaches, to reconcile those that were at Variance, and raise up them that are fallen; That they might all with one Accord glorify the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Then they were to propose the following Canons, viz. That after *Photius's* Decease, no Layman should be raised to the Patriarchal Dignity; that *Photius* should send no *Pallium* into *Bulgaria*, nor make any Ordination there. 'Tis very probable, the Pope had enjoyned *Photius* to beg Pardon of the Council, as is mention'd in the Pope's true Letters. But this Article is not found in the Memoir which we have only from *Photius*, nor in the Letters of Pope *John* the VIII. which he caused to be read in the Council, and out of which he had razed this Article with some others, as he had added unto it an Article against the eighth Council, to be found also in this Memoir, falsify'd by *Photius* in the like Manner. All this was done by the

Pope in a Synod held at *Rome*, consisting of 17. Bishops of *Italy*, 4. Cardinal-Priests, and 2. Deacons, whose Hands are to be found at the End of this Memoir.

Peter being arrived at *Constantinople* in 879. *Photius* summon'd thither a full Council, to which he gave the Name of the VIII. Oecumenical Council; which, by his Account, consisted of 383. Bishops. The first Thing he declared, at the Opening of the Assembly, was, That Pope *John* the VIII. had received him into his Communion; first, by his two first Legates, *Paul* and *Eugenius*; next by *Peter* the Priest, whom he had sent purposely for it. Whereupon *John*, Bishop of *Heraclea*, complained, That the Church of *Rome* had occasioned all the Troubles befallen to the Church of *Constantinople*, blaming the Conduct of the Popes *Nicholas* and *Adrian*, and exalting that of *John* the VIII.

In the second Session, held the 16th. of November, the Pope's Letters to the Emperor and to *Photius* were read: But so falsify'd, that what concerned *Ignatius* was razed out, as were also the Injunction to *Photius*, to beg Pardon before the Council, some advantageous Expressions about the Holy See, and what related to the Restitution of *Bulgaria*: Which was supply'd with high Commendations of the Emperor and *Photius*, and the Condemnation of the eighth Council. These Letters being read, *Photius* extolled his Kindness which he pretended himself to have to *Ignatius* the Patriarch, and promised that he would honour his Memory. After this, a Letter from *Michael* the Patriarch of *Antioch*, upon this Subject, was read; wherein he required also the Condemnation of the eighth Council. Then was called in *Thomas*, Archbishop of *Cæsarea*, the only Deputy from the East, that had assisted at the eighth Council. *Photius* caused him to renounce what he had both said and done in that Council. The Letters from the Patriarchs of *Jerusalem* and *Antioch* to *Photius*, were likewise read; wherein they gave him very high Commendations, and owned him as Patriarch. This Session ended with the reading of a Letter from *Abramius* Archbishop of *Amydus*, who writ very sharply against the eighth Council.

In the third Session, held Nov. the 18th. the Letters from Pope *John* the VIII. to the Church of *Constantinople*, to the Bishops of that Patriarchate, and to the Patriarchs of the East, were read. In which, expressing his Desire to procure the Peace of their Church, the Bishops of that Patriarchate declared thereupon, that they had Peace amongst them, before the Coming of that Letter; and some Mention being made of *Bulgaria*, they judged it reasonable that Affair should be referred to the Emperor, the Bounds of the Empire being concerned therein. A Letter from the Patriarch of *Jerusalem* to the Emperor was likewise read, wherein having deplored the Miseries and Calamities of his Church, he prayed that Prince to assist it with his Princely Charity. Lastly, The Pope's Instructions to his Legates, an Abstract whereof we have already made, came also to be read.

In the fourth Session there appeared a Deputy from the Patriarch of *Antioch*, who brought some Letters from that Patriarch, and that of *Jerusalem*, both written in the Behalf of *Photius*. Wherein they declared, That the Deputies, who had assisted at the eighth Council, in the Name of their respective Churches, had been sent by the *Saracens*. These Letters being read, the Noblemen came in who had assisted at the said Council, and expressed their Sorrow for what they had done, being (as they pretended) imposed upon by the false Deputies of the Patriarchs. Five Articles were read, which were proposed in the Name of the Pope's Legates. The first, about the Restitution of *Bulgaria* to the See of *Rome*: The second, that for the Future no Layman should be elected Patriarch of *Constantinople*: The third, that no Clerk of another Church should be chosen: The fourth, to abrogate the Council held against *Photius*: And the fifth, that those should be excommunicated who refused to hold Communion with *Photius*. All which Articles, except the first about *Bulgaria*, were approved of by the Council.

In the fifth Session, held Jan. the 26th. 880. *Photius* complained, That the Church of *Rome* seemed unwilling to receive the seventh General Council. But the Pope's Legates having satisfy'd the Council in that Matter, it was decreed unanimously, That that Council should stand for the seventh Oecumenical.

After this, *Metrophanes*, Metropolitan of *Syria*, was summoned to appear, for refusing to hold Communion with *Photius*. Whereupon the Pope's Legates required a Canon to be made, disabling *Photius* from receiving such as had been excommunicated or deposed by the Bishop of *Rome*, and the Bishop of *Rome* from receiving those that had been condemned or excommunicated by *Photius*: This was the first Canon. The second was made upon the Remonstrance of *Photius*, and order'd, that Bishops that turned Monks, should not retain their Bishopricks, and disabled them from the Recovery thereof. A third Canon was added, against such as should imprison, or abuse Bishops. This done, the Acts of the Council were signed by the Legates, and all the Bishops.

May the 10th. they met together in the Emperor's Palace, in whose Presence was read the Symbol, or Creed of the Council

Of the Council of Constantinople, with a Prohibition to add any thing to it; which was against the *Latin* Creed, to which was added the *Filioque*. *Basilius* the Emperor with the Princes his Sons, subscribed to this, and disapproved, by his Subscription, all that had been transacted against *Photius*.

May the 13th. the Bishops met again in the Great Church, to whom was read the Creed agreed upon in the last Meeting, and repeated Anathema's pronounced against all Persons that should either add to, or take any Thing from it. Thus you have an Abstract of the Acts of this Council, published by *Baronius*, and taken out of the Acts themselves, the Manuscripts whereof are to be found in the *Vatican* Library, and that of the *Colonna's*.

The Pope's Legates returned to *Rome*, with Letters from the Emperor and *Photius* to the Pope; to whom they made their Report of *Photius's* Restoration, and of the peaceable State wherein they left the Churches of *Constantinople*. The Pope, in his Answer, congratulated the Emperor for it, and returned him his Thanks, at the same time, for his Care in sending Gallies for the Defence of the Territory of *Rome* against the *Saracens*; for his restoring to the Church of *Rome* *St. Sergius's* Monastery in the Neighbourhood of *Constantinople*; and, lastly, for having restored *Bulgaria* to the See of *Rome*. He prays him to continue his Good Will to that See; and adds, at the End of the Letter, that he allows of the Acts of the Council at *Constantinople* for the Restoration of *Photius*; but, if his Legates had any way trespassed upon his Orders, he disowns all such Actings, and declares them void. This Letter bore Date, August the thirteenth, 880.

He also congratulated *Photius* upon his Restoration, for which he told him he was obliged to the Holy See; but blamed him for refusing to make a Publick Acknowledgment of his Fault, and beg the Council's Pardon. He enjoins him to submit himself, and the Faithful to the Holy See; and ends his Letter with the same Clause contained in that to the Emperor: Which shews, that he was not, as yet, fully informed of all those Things the Legates had consented to. And indeed, when he understood how they had been surprised, he went up to the Choir of his Church, from whence he fulminated his Excommunication against all Persons that should not receive the Condemnation of *Photius*; and, having deposed his Legates, he sent *Marinus*, who had been twice already Legate in the *East*, to repair the Mischief done by the late Legates. *Marinus* being arrived at *Constantinople*, did strenuously maintain what had been done under Pope *Nicholas*, and in the eighth Council against *Photius*, refusing to consent to the Abrogation of the Acts of that Council. The Emperor incensed at his Presumption, in disannulling what the other had ratified, caused him to be cast into Prison; and having kept him there the Space of thirty days, thinking that Mortification would make him change his Mind, he sent him back to *Rome*, where his Constancy was soon requited. For Pope *John* dying in the Beginning of the Year 882, he was chosen to be his next Successor on the first of February.

Being raised to that High Station, the first Thing that he did was, to condemn *Photius* again; to declare void all the Episcopal Functions he had took upon him; and to abrogate all the Acts of the false Council of *Photius*. His Pontificate having lasted but one year and odd days, he had for his Successor *Adrian*, the third of that Name, to whom *Basilius* the Emperor made present Applications, to get him to own *Photius*. But this Pope, on the contrary, did openly declare against him, and confirmed what his Predecessor had done. *Basilius*, provoked by this Denial, writ *Adrian* a Letter full of Invectives against the Bishops of *Rome*, but chiefly against *Marinus*; affirming; that he could not legally be chosen Bishop of *Rome*, because of his being Bishop of another Church. This Letter was deliver'd to Pope *Stephen* the Vth. who succeeded *Adrian* in 885. *Stephen* made a sober, but smart Answer to the Emperor; in which he tells him, that he wonders how he could write in so violent a Style to his Predecessor; for he could not be ignorant, that the Sacerdotal Dignity was not any way subject to the Regal Power; That, though the Emperor represented Christ upon Earth, 'tis only in respect to Civil and Temporal Things; And that, as God has given him a Supreme Power over the Things of this World, so has he given, by *St. Peter*, to his Successors, a Supreme Authority over Spiritual Things. That it was the Emperor's Part to destroy with the Sword the Impiety and Barbarity of Tyrants; to do Justice to his Subjects; to make Laws; and to have Armies both by Sea and Land; but that the Care of Christ's Flock is committed to the High-Priests; a Dignity as much above that of Kings, as Heavenly Things are above Spiritual. He exhorts him to follow the Pope's Decrees, and to respect their Dignity. He charges with Blasphemy all that have offer'd to calumniate his Predecessor *Marinus*, and sharply rebukes him for his giving Credit to such Calumnies. He asks him, by whom he was constituted a Judge of the Holy High-Priests? And how he knows that *Marinus* was not a Bishop? He excuses his being translated, by several Instances. Moreover, he affirms,

that the Pope is not liable to any Man's Judgment; and says, that Pope *Sylvester* caused a Declaration of it to be made by his Legates in the *Nicene* Council: A Fact that cannot be proved. He justifies all the Proceedings of *Marinus* and his Predecessors against *Photius*, exhorts the Emperor to put him out of his See, and to fill his Place by another Patriarch. He complains of the ill Usage *Marinus* had at his Court. Lastly, He commends the Emperor for designing one of his Sons for the Sacerdotal Office; and requires his Assistance for the Defence of *Rome* and all *Italy*, both by Sea and Land, against the Descents and Inroads of the Barbarians.

This Letter came to *Constantinople* after *Basilius's* Decease, and was delivered to his Son *Leo*, who succeeded him in 886. This Prince was an Enemy to *Photius*, upon a Jealousie he had that *Photius* had made use of *Santarabenus* to put him out of his Father's Favour, who had forced him to a private Life. Glad therefore of this Opportunity, at his Accession to the Imperial Throne, to be revenged of his Enemies, he presently turn'd out *Photius*, and banished him into a Monastery in *Armenia*; caused *Santarabenus's* Eyes to be put out; sent him into Exile to *Athenis*; and caused *Stephen*, his own Brother, to be chosen Patriarch of *Constantinople*: Which Election was approved of by *Styllianus* Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, and by the other Bishops that were *Photius's* Adversaries: who in their own Names, and the Names of the Clergy of *Constantinople*, together with the Abbots and Monks of the Empire, sent a Letter to Pope *Stephen*. In which having related all that had passed from the Beginning, in *Photius's* Case, and how *Leo* the Emperor had no sooner ascended the Throne of his Father, but he presently turn'd him out, and by that means delivered them from the Miseries they groaned under for not submitting to him; they earnestly intreat him to pardon those who had held Communion with *Photius* a second time: by which Indulgence, he would save a World of People, proving that it had been practised by the Church upon several Occasions. However they acquaint him, that they would not suffer the Bishops of *Photius's* Faction to perform any Sacerdotal Functions, whatever Permission they pretended to have from the Holy See, till they had a certain Account of the Pope's Pleasure in it; and that the rest who had submitted to *Photius*, and were compelled to do it, were the more excusable. The Emperor writ also to the Pope; but only acquainted him by his Letters, that *Photius* had withdrawn himself of his own accord, and had embraced a private Life.

Pope *Stephen*, in his Answer to the Bishops that had writ Letters to him, told them, they had just Cause to turn out *Photius*, from Pope as by their Letters he was informed they had done; but *Stephen* that the Emperor having signified unto him, that he had withdrawn himself, he was perplexed what Answer to give. That there was a vast Difference betwixt being turned out, and quitting a Dignity of his own accord. Therefore not being able to pass his Judgment upon the Matter without a full Information, he had put it off; and thought it necessary that Bishops should be sent on both sides, that all things being duly examined, and the Truth found out, he might order that which should be most acceptable unto God.

The Bishops answered Pope *Stephen*, that the Difference found in their Letter and that of the Emperor, came from hence, that *Photius's* Friends, who acknowledged him for Patriarch, were obliged to give it out, that he had voluntarily quitted his Patriarchate: Which they did not; who followed the Judgment of the Popes *Nicholas* and *Adrian*, and their Legates; for they look'd upon him only as a Layman, and said, he would never have voluntarily left it. They wondered, that having said in the Beginning of his Letter, that *Photius* had been rejected, he should say at the latter End, that he must be brought into Judgment, as if it were doubtful whether he is a Bishop or not: That, if he were brought again into Judgment, he would be found still more guilty; and to pass by other Matters, they did not think it convenient to pardon what the World knew he had done against *Marinus*. Lastly, They repeat their former Entreaties in behalf of those whom *Photius* had forced into his Communion, and pray him to send Circular Letters to the Patriarchs of the East, that they may approve of, and confirm the Condescension which he had used towards those Persons. To which they add, that it was the Emperor's Desire, who by rejecting of *Photius* had delivered them from his Persecution; and that it was no way repugnant to the Canons, *Photius* being rejected, to admit to Penance such as had been compelled to hold Communion with him. This Letter was delivered to Pope *Formosus*, who succeeded *Stephen*, Anno 891.

This Pope answered to *Styllianus*, that he was not plain enough in his Letter; that he desired Favour, without telling the Manner, or for whom, whether for Laymen or Bishops. If for Laymen, he was willing to grant it; but if for Bishops, and that they might remain in their Dignity, he ought to observe, that *Photius* could not confer an Episcopal Dignity which he had not; that he could confer Nothing but the Condemnation he had received; that praying

Of the Contest between Photius and Ignatius.

Photius turned out again.

Letters from Pope Stephen to the Greek Bishops.

The Bishops Answer to Pope Stephen.

Formosus's Reply to the Bishops Letter to Pope Stephen.

ing in Behalf of those he had ordained, was to countenance him, who had ordained them; that on the contrary, the Church of Rome ought to inflict severe Penalties upon such Persons, to purge thoroughly by that means the Church of Constantinople; that however his Clemency and Lenity inclined him to the Toleration of some Things, but that there were others that could not be dispensed with; that he had appointed *Landulphus* Bishop of *Capua*, and *Romanus* his Legate à *Latere*, with whom they should consult about Matters, joyning with them *Theophiladus* Bishop of *Ancyra*, and *Peter* in whom he reposed a great Trust, provided nevertheless that the Condemnation of *Photius* should stand; and as to those whom he had ordained, they might be received as Laymen into the Church-Communion, if they acknowledged their Fault in Writing, and begged to be admitted to Penance; that done, he might do in conjunction with his Legates what he should think most expedient, these two Articles remaining untouch'd.

But, whereas the Number of Bishops, Priests, and other Clerks ordained by *Photius* was so great, that all the Churches almost had been left destitute, if the Clergy ordained by him had been made Laymen, therefore this Regulation could not be put in Execution in the East: So that *Syrianus* and others were forced at last to tolerate them, and hold Communion with them; but since they should have been better satisfied if they could get the Consent of the Holy See to it, *Syrianus* endeavoured seven Years after to get it, and writ to the Pope for it. Then was *John IX.* raised to the Papal See, who declined to return an Answer himself, but ordered one to be sent him in his Name, to this purpose, that he thanked him for his firm Adherency to the Church of Rome, that he hoped at last the Obstinate would submit, that Peace would be restored to the Church, and an End put to a Schism that had continued the Space of 40 Years. That he expected his Predecessors Decrees should be inviolably observed; that he had the same Sentiments of *Ignatius*, *Photius*, *Stephen*, and *Anthony*, as his Predecessors *Nicholas*, *John*, *Stephen*, and the whole Roman Church; that he would deal with them, and look'd upon them as they had done, and received into the Church-Communion all those he had ordained, upon the same Conditions they had prescribed. This was the last Answer of the Popes upon this Matter, whose Judgment the Greeks did not follow, for they left in their respective Stations not only such as had sided with *Photius*, but also those whom he had ordained. From which Time the Latin and Greek Churches held no good Intelligence, though it seems they did not break off Communion altogether. For both the Emperor, and the Patriarchs of Constantinople, used to write to the Pope, and the Pope to return Answer; who also sent his Legates into the East, as in the Business of *Nicholas* the Patriarch upon the fourth Marriage of *Leo* the Emperor; who, having lost three Wives without Issue, resolved to marry again. But meeting with strong Opposition against it from the Patriarch, he in the Year 901. desired Legates from Pope *John IX.* and made them approve of his fourth Marriage. Whereupon he turned out *Nicholas* the Patriarch, and put *Euthymius* in his Place. This Business renewed the Troubles of the Church of Constantinople: For, after *Leo's* Death, *Nicholas* was restored to his See in 912, and writ a Letter to the Pope concerning it, praying him to punish those who had stirred up those Troubles against him. Some time after, having reconciled the Minds of Men, and restored Peace to the Church of Constantinople, he desired Pope *John X.* by another Letter, to endeavour a Re-union of their respective Churches, the Peace whereof seemed to have been for some time interrupted, and to re-settle a sincere Correspondence betwixt them by sending Legates on both sides, and declaring with one Accord that fourth Marriages are unlawful, and therefore prohibited. It does not appear that the Pope made any Answer to it; but an Assembly was held at Constantinople in 921. which absolutely prohibited such Matches for the future, and excommunicated all Persons so contracted, till such time as they were parted. As for third Marriages, they were not absolutely forbidden; but a Penance was ordered for five Years to all Persons that should marry three times after forty Years of Age, or even before that Age, provided they had had Children by the first Marriage. We find that *John XIII.* sent Legates in 968. to *Nicephorus* the Eastern Emperor, to treat of a Match with his Daughter-in-law, and *Otho* the Western Emperor; but those Legates were slighted and abused by the Greeks, as was also *Luitprandus*, *Otho's* Ambassador. In short, 'tis very plain, that there was in those Times no good Correspondence betwixt the Latins and the Greeks; that the Latins were hated and slighted by the Greeks, and these but little regarded by the Latins. But as little Friendship as there was amongst them, yet they did not openly condemn each other, nor did their Enmity break out openly till the Time of *Michael Cerularius*, as will appear in its proper Place.

Before we conclude this Chapter, it will not be improper to speak of the Works of *Photius*.

The most considerable Fruit of *Photius's* Studies and Labours, is his Library intitled *Myriobiblon*, composed by him at the Request of *Tarasius* his Brother, being yet a Layman, and Ambassador in *Affyria*. It contains the Argument or Abstracts of 279 or 280 Volumes of many Authors, upon various Subjects. Wherein we find Grammarians, Criticks, Poets, Orators, sacred and prophane Historians, Physicians, Philosophers, Divines, &c. not ranked according to their several Arts or Professions, but brought in confusedly, and as they came first into his Memory. As he goes forward in this Work, he seems to increase his Labour by the Length of his Abstracts. For in the Beginning he sets down in a few Words the general Argument of the Works he speaks of, and delivers his Censure upon them. Then he attempts a larger Account of the Matters therein contained; and towards the End he makes long Abstracts thereof, without Choice or Reflections. Thus, as his Work swells, he falls short in his Exactness; and his Spirits being wearied with the Length of the Work, he grows careless and negligent, producing Nothing of his own, but contenting himself to transcribe faithfully what comes in his Way. And indeed the End of his Work is so unlike the Beginning, that some eminent Scholars have thought it could not be *Photius's*. There is Nothing to be seen of that Exactness, of that fine critical Wit, of that free and impartial Judgment upon the Character and Style of the Authors, or of that inimitable Exactness which appears in the Beginning. Yet it is very probable, the Weariness and Negligence of *Photius* were the Reason why he was not so accurate towards the End as he was in the Beginning. For the Number of Works mentioned in the Preliminary Letter being only found compleat at the End, 'tis not credible that what *Photius* had done should be taken out, to substitute in Lieu of it the Productions of any others. Nay, it seems that *Photius* had purposely altered his Method, thinking it more useful to give larger Abstracts of the Works he went upon, than barely to tell the Subject. For there are some Authors of which he speaks but succinctly in the Beginning, and speaks of 'em again towards the End, to give larger Abstracts of their Works. But whatever Reason induced him so to do, whether it was to make his Work less tedious or more useful, it cannot be denied but that it had been more proper to joyn the general Argument and the Censure to be given upon each Work, to Abstracts of particular Places worth taking Notice of. 'Twere to be wished, that *Photius* had performed both the one and the other in all the Parts of his Work, and that he had not contented himself to do one of them only. The World however is very much indebted to him, and his Work a very rich Treasure nevertheless, including what is most curious in every Science, and preserving to us both the Memory of Authors, and some Fragments of Abundance of Works, which had been unknown to us, and Nothing whereof had remain'd with us, had it not been for this learned Man's Work.

This so useful a Work was found out by the Jesuit *Andrew Schot*, who caused it to be transcribed from a Manuscript of Cardinal *Sirles's* Library, and to be compared with a Copy thereof in the Vatican, taken out of a Manuscript at Venice, written by the Hand of Cardinal *Bessarion*. He communicated this Copy to *David Hoeschelius*, a Printer of *Ausburg*, who caused it to be printed in 1601; being first compared with three other Copies, one in the Duke of *Bavaria's* Library, and the two other being procured for him by *Margunius*, and the Son of *Henry Stephen*, who had a Copy written by his Father's own Hand and revised by an Ancient Manuscript. *Andrew Schot*, a Man extraordinary well skilled in the Greek Tongue, considering the Usefulness of this Work, undertook to translate it into Latin; and having happily compassed his Design, caused his Translation to be printed alone at *Ausburg*, Anno 1606. Afterwards, both the Text and the Translation were printed together at *Geneva* in 1611; and lastly, in the Year 1653, this Work was re-printed at *Rouen* by the *Berthe-lins*. This Edition is the largest and fairest.

Photius's *Nomocanon* is another Proof of this Author's great Ability. 'Tis a Collection digested in an excellent Method, and brought under 14 different Titles, of the Canons of the Councils and Canonical Epistles, and of the Emperor's Laws about Ecclesiastical Matters. *Balsamon* has made Comments upon this Work, and with these Comments it appeared in publick by the care of *Monsieur Justel*, being printed at *Paris* in Greek, with a Latin Version at the End, in 1615; the Version being first printed both at *Paris* and *Basil*, in 1561. This Work is also found amongst *Balsamon's* Works (printed at *Paris* in 1620.) and in the Pandects of the Canons of England, [put out by *Justellus* at *Paris*, in 1662.]

The Delicateness of *Photius's* Style, and Fineness of his Wit, as well as his Learning, and his particular Knowledge of Holy Scripture, are in a special Manner conspicuous in his Letters, which appeared first long after his Works before-mentioned. They were publish'd from a Manuscript brought

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

Photius's
Library.

The last
Answers of
the Popes
to the
Greeks.

Prills of
the Church
of Rome
with the
Greek
Churches.

The No-
mocanon
of Photius

Photius's
Letters

brought from the East into England, translated by Richard Montague Bishop of Norwich, and printed at London, Anno 1651. They are in Number 248.

The first, written to Michael King of Bulgaria, is an Instruction directed to that Prince. To whom he proposes the Creed in the first place, as the Foundation of our Christian Faith; after which, he brings in the Decisions of the Seven General Councils, of which he makes a Compendious History. He tells him, We cannot depart from the Purity of the Doctrine settled by those Councils, without indangering our Salvation. He exhorts him firmly to adhere to the Faith, and to joyn Virtues and Good Works to a lively true Faith. In short, he lays before him the chief Duties of a Christian Prince, the Virtues that are most necessary for him, and the Manner how he ought to govern himself. 'Tis one of the best and compleatest Instructions that were ever given to a Prince; and, 'twould be a hard Matter to find a larger, exacter, or more solid Collection of Precepts.

The second is the Circular Letter which he sent to all the Patriarchs of the East against the Roman Church in 866. Wherein he takes Occasion to reproach her with what had passed in Bulgaria, which was but newly converted to the Christian Faith, where some Persons were found come from the West, who spread such Doctrines as were repugnant to the Purity of the Faith. First, by making the Bulgarians fast on Saturdays, against the Laws of the Church which forbid it. Which might occasion a Contempt of the Doctrine; because when Men take upon them to slight Tradition, even in the least Things, they are easily prevail'd with to slight the Doctrine it self. Secondly, by distinguishing the first Week in Lent from the rest, and permitting them to eat in that Week, Milk, Butter, Cheese, &c. Thirdly, by detesting married Priests. Fourthly, by causing them to be anointed again with the Chrism, that had been already anointed with it by the Priests; affirming, that Unction ought not to be made by Priests. He exclaims against the Prohibition, affirming, that there is no Law reserving that Unction to the Bishop, or prohibiting the same to the Priests. Lastly, he charges the Latin Church with Breach of Faith, and falsifying of the Creed; by teaching, that the Holy Ghost does not only proceed from the Father, but from the Father and the Son. Upon this Article he doth enlarge very much, and alledges many Objections against the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son. Then he breaks out against those who had taught the Bulgarians this Doctrine, and does excommunicate them, by Vertue of the Canons, about the Saturdays Fast, and the Celibacy of Priests. He exhorts the Patriarchs to joyn with him in banishing that Doctrine, to send Bishops to Constantinople, to have those new Tenents exploded, and put a Stop to those Evils, that the Bulgarians may receive the true Faith. He acquaints them, that he has received a Letter from Italy, against the Tyranny of the Church of Rome. He admonishes them to receive, and cause to be received, in all the Churches of their Patriarchates, the seventh General Council, in the same Manner, and with the same Authority as the first six.

In the third Letter, which is to Bardas, he complains of what he was to suffer in the Place where he was, and seems to speak much like a Christian.

In the following Letters he also makes his Complaints of the Wrongs done him.

In the 18th. he writes to Michael the Emperor, about the Death of Bardas. He owns he deserved it, if he had actually conspired to make himself sole Master of the Empire, as he could not doubt of it upon the Account of the Letters Michael had sent him. But he laments his Death, because he had not Time to do Penance for his Sins. He very much flatters Michael, and expresses to him the great Desire he has to see him again shortly at Constantinople. The same Thing he insinuates, but in more flattering and pathetic Terms, in the next Letter.

In the 20th. he congratulates a Monk, for having brought over a Bishop to his Party.

In the 27th. he writes against certain Monks, who had took upon them to depose their Abbot, and observes, that Monks ought not to set up themselves as Judges of their own Abbots, but they ought to refer their Cause to their Superiors.

In the 30th. he proves the Perpetual Virginity of the Blessed Virgin; and explains that Place of Scripture, where it is said, *That she knew not Joseph till she had brought forth her first-born*; observing, that the Particle *Donec (till)* doth not always imply, that the contrary to that which had not happened before, doth happen afterwards.

In the 31st. directed to Tarasius a Nobleman, whom he calls his Brother, he treats of Providence; and shews, why Good Men suffer in this Life, whilst the Wicked wallow in Prosperity.

In the 32d. and the seven next following, directed to Theodistus the Abbot, he explains, in short, the Faith of the Mysteries Trinity, and of the Incarnation, against Hereticks. He also speaks smartly therein against the Iconoclasts.

VOL. II.

The next ten consist of Moral Exhortations to several Persons.

The 50th. is upon the Covenants of the Law and Gospel. The next three consist of Reprimands to a Collector of Taxes, for his Coverousness.

In the 54th. he proves, that the Holy Mysteries ought not to be given to Infidels, or Hereticks, nor to Ill-Livers, but only to Orthodox Persons, who live according to the Rules of Christianity.

The 55th. is against a Liar.

In the 63d. he gives the Reasons for the Darkness of Prophecies.

In the 64th. he confutes the Iconoclasts, and answers to some of their Objections.

In the 72d. he shews, how contemptible our Temporal Life is.

In the 74th. he pretends, that Abraham made his Servant swear, by putting his Hand under his Thigh, in Honour to the Circumcision, and as a Figure of the Messiah to come out of his Seed.

The 97th. was written to Basilus the Emperor, after he had turned him out of his See of Constantinople. He complains, in this Letter, of the ill Treatment he had received, and particularly, that his Books were taken from him. He gives a very pathetic Account of the Persecution he suffer'd, and writes smartly to the Emperor.

In the next Letters he continues to deplore his Misfortunes, and speaks of the Earthquake that happen'd at Constantinople upon his Expulsion.

In the 102d. he examines, how St. Paul could be both a Roman of Tarsis, and a Jew.

The 111th. is directed to Gregory of Syracuse, his old and constant Friend. Wherein he exhorts him to stand firm under his present ill Circumstances, and not to discontinue his Episcopal Functions.

In the 115th. he says, that the Council, which he calls Heretical, and which was made up of the Enemies to Image-worship, has excommunicated him, to raise a Man to the See of Constantinople, who lay under an Anathema. He speaks of the eighth Council.

In the next Letters, he writes against that Council, but chiefly in the 118th.

In the 125th. he gives Mystical Reasons for the Tearing of the Veil of the Temple, when our Saviour died.

In the 127th. he explains that Place of Scripture, where it is said, *That the Sin against the Holy Ghost shall never be pardon'd*.

In the following Letters, he expounds some other Places of Scripture, for which he brings Mystical Reasons, well invented, and happily apply'd.

In the 137th. he affirms, that what is said in St. Luke's Gospel, that our Saviour sweated Drops of Blood, is not to be understood literally; but that it is a Proverbial Expression, to signify, that the Pains he felt were so very violent, that he sweated great Drops. To which he adds, that this History of the Gospel has been left out of the Gospel by some, and particularly by some Syrians; but his Opinion is, that it ought to be received as Canonical, and to be put amongst the Scriptures of Divine Inspiration.

In the 139th. he shews, that it is not impossible, as some pretended, to look upon a Woman, without sinful Thoughts.

The 144th. is against Eusebius of Casarea, whom he charges with Arianism.

In the 147th. Photius examines what it is to take God's Name in vain; and says, that among the Jews, Taking of God's Name in vain, was to give it to the Idols, or make use of it for a false Oath, or prophane it in idle Discourses. That among Christians, those take God's Name in vain, who swear against that which is established by Law, or who attribute God's Name to Creatures, as a Being which they believe created, as also, those who confound Images with Idols, and all Hereticks who abuse that Name.

In the 152d. he expounds, as the Pelagians do, that Place of St. Paul's Epistle, where it is said, *in which all have sinned*; pretending, after Theodoret, that it ought not to be thus translated, but *whereas all have sinned*.

In the following Letters, he treats of divers Critical Questions.

In the 162d. he treats of the Names of God; and shews, by several Instances, that the Name of God is sometimes given to Creatures, with relation to their Excellency, Justice, or Power. He observes, the Jews were forbidden to name God by his proper Name, and that none but the High-Priest bore it, which he did in his Forehead, written in extraordinary and strange Letters. He adds, that the Hebrews pronounce it *Aia*, and the Samaritans, *Jabe*; that it is written with these four Letters, *Joth, Aleph, Van, He*, signifying *That is, viz. He that is, and endures for ever*.

In the next Letter, he demonstrates, how it was not absolutely forbidden among the Jews, to hear or pronounce that Name, seeing Moses heard it, and taught it the High-Priests, who wore it written upon Plates of Gold; but that they were forbidden, upon pain of Death, to pronounce it before Strangers.

In the 164th. he examines what may be the Sense of the 13th Verse, Chap I. of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

C c

The

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.

The 165th. contains a fine Encomium of St. Paul's Wisdom and Eloquence.

In the 166th. he explains several Places of St. Paul's Epistles something dark, by reason of their Hyperbata, or Ellipsis, i. e. Transpositions, or Defects of Words usual in them.

The 174th. contains Photius's Apology against one of his former Friends, who now inveighed against him for his Contradictious Humour, charged him with betraying the Catholick Church, and violating her Laws. Photius to vindicate himself from his Aspersions, maintains, that he has not undertaken, done, said, or writ any Thing that might give any just Ground to that Accusation; and that he could be reproached with Nothing but the Hardships he had endured, and the Misery he was reduced to by the Persecution of his Enemies: Which he gives an Account of in the most sensible Manner; affirming, that his Misfortunes had neither dispirited, nor made him slight the Divine Truth. His Adversary pretended, that it was ill done of him, to draw that Persecution on himself for Things of small Consequence. But Photius, to justify himself, affirms, that his Enemies are our Saviour's Enemies, who rendred contemptible (as far as in them lay) the Blood of his Covenant, prophaned his Altars, and ridiculed the Holy Chrism, or rather the Holy Ghost, who had consecrated it. He protests, he will never hold Communion with such Men, nor with those who shall receive them. Next, he deplores the Miseries of those who suffer Persecution for his sake; and complains, that he is abandon'd almost by all the World. He concludes, saying, that he ever offers Sacrifices and Prayers to God for his Prince.

In the 176th. Letter, he recites the different Expositions of this Place of Scripture given by the Fathers, viz. *My Father is greater than I*.

In the 177th. speaking of St. Peter's Fall, he owns his Primacy.

In the 180th. and the two next, he explains some Places of the Gospel.

In the 182th. he deplores his Misfortunes.

In the 187th. he defends strongly, and rationally against Julian's Raileries, our Saviour's Advice, to sell a Man's Substance to give it to the Poor.

In the 188th. he congratulates himself for his Sufferings.

In the 192th. he observes upon the Word *Ephod*, that it signifies, 1. A Priestly Habit. 2. A Habit like unto that worn by Laymen. 3. The Habits of the Priests of the Heathen Gods, who imitated the Ceremonies of the Priests of the True God.

The 201st. is a Letter of Comfort to George of Nicomedia, upon the Death of a Clerk ordained a Priest by him. He says, that his Soul is in Abraham's Bosom, where it enjoys the Heavenly Glory.

In the 211th. he expounds a difficult Place of Genesis, about the Sacrifices of Cain and Abel.

The 223rd. and the three next, are likewise upon some difficult Places of Scripture.

In the 228th. he expounds that Place in the Gospel, so frequently objected by the Arians, that none but the Father knows the Day of Judgment.

The 234th. is a long Epistle, no less Christian than Eloquent, directed to Tarasius's Brother, to comfort him upon the Death of his Daughter.

In the 240th. he handles two Critical Questions upon Scripture. The first, who was *Ethan* the Zeraite. The second, concerning David's Two Unctions. The third, about Samuel's serving Saul.

The 243rd. and 244th. consist of ingenious Reproofs to Friend of his, who forsook him through Timorousness.

The 245th. is a Piece of Comfort directed to a Nun, upon the Death of her Sister. Wherein he supposes her Soul to be in the Company of Angels.

The 246th. and 247th. are upon the Birth-place of St. Paul.

In the 248th. he discovers the Mystical Reasons of the Circumcision.

Montieur Cotelierius has published in the Second Tome of the Monuments of the Greek Church, [Page 104.] a short Letter of Photius to Smaracus, Governor of the Isle of Cyprus, against that Minister's Avarice and Extortions; with a compendious Discourse of the same Photius, shewing, that we ought to take care but of one Thing in this Life, that is, to forbear Sin; and, as we ought not to regard the Casualties and Misfortunes of this Life, nor look upon them as Evils; so Honour, Riches, Power, Eloquence, and other Advantages, either of Nature or Fortune, ought not to be regarded as a real Good.

Photius's Letter to the Patriarch of Aquileia, is much beyond the former. Baronius has inserted a Translation of it in his Annals [ad An. 883.] but it came out since in Greek by the Care of Father Combefis, in the last Addition to the *Bibliotheca Patrum* [at Paris, 1673.] In this Letter, having first highly extolled that Archbishop, and complimented him about the Deputy he had sent unto him, he argues against the Doctrine of the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, as an Error contrary to Tradition. He says,

that the Popes, Leo the I. and Leo the III. have rejected that Doctrine. The first, by saying in his Letter, against Of the Nestorius and Eutyches, that the Holy Ghost doth proceed from the Father; and the last, by disproving those that had bereft added the *Filioque* to the Creed, and causing it to be engraven on Plates without that Addition. He afterwards brings and in many Arguments, grounded upon some Places of Scripture, against the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son. He answers to the Place alledged by the Latins, *The Holy Ghost shall receive from me, and will declare it to you*. He objects to himself, that St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and some other Fathers have said, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son. He owns it to have been their Opinion, and that they ought not therefore to be called Hereticks. But he pretends, their Authority must not be preferred before that of a greater Number, who spoke according to the Councils and the Holy Writ. He adds, that some Fathers of the Church may have swerved from the Truth; but, whatever Respect we have for their Persons we ought not to follow their Errors. As for Instance, though Dionysius of Alexandria be ranked amongst the Fathers, the Arian Expressions he used are not to be approved; as well as some Tenents of Methodius, St. Irenaeus, and Papias. Lastly, he dares affirm, that if all the Men in the World should oppose us, we ought still to adhere to our Saviour's Words, and those of the Gospel; and, if we do seek after Proofs, next to our Saviour, we have the Suffrages of Oecumenical Councils, the greatest Number of the Fathers, the Bishops of Rome, and amongst these St. Leo, and Adrian the I. That the Legates themselves of the Holy See, which lately have been in the East three several Times, have alledged nothing contrary to that Doctrine; and that in the Council held by him, the Legates of Pope John had subscribed unto, and approved of the Creed, without that Addition. Thus much is alledged by Photius in his Letter, to make good his Opinion.

His Work containing a compendious History of the first seven General Councils, which has been several Times published separately, is Nothing but Part of the first Letter directed to Michael King of the Bulgarians.

But, as Photius had Skill in Composition, so he was no less versed in Preaching. We have many Manuscript Homilies of his, whereof Father Combefis has printed the Titles and Beginnings in the last Addition to the *Biblioth. Patrum*. But there are only two whole ones extant: One upon the Virgin's Nativity, inserted by the same Author into his first Continuation of the *Biblioth. Patrum*, and written with much Eloquence and Politeness. The other containing the Description and Encomium of a new Church in the Emperor's Palace at Constantinople, published by Codinus and Combefis in their Collections.

In fine, Photius had joyned all the Subtlety of the most refined Schoolmen to his other sorts of Learning. In Canisius's Collection we have some small Treatises of his in Latin, which are a convincing Proof of his great Ability in School-Learning. The principal of which, is that of our Saviour's Wills, which are called Gnomical; found in the Tome added by Stuart to Canisius's Collection. It was in Greek in the Emperor and the Duke of Bavaria's Libraries, out of which Turrian took it, and put it into Latin. The State of the Question is to know, whether our Saviour had, besides a general Will to do a Thing, a particular Will to do it in such and such a Manner, whether he has chosen and affected the one more than the other. Photius in the first place says, that this Question, having been but slightly handled by the Fathers, is the more difficult to solve; but that 'tis an easie Matter to find out all that has been written upon it, St. Maximus being the only Father that he found treating of this Question. And, to expound him, he distinguishes many sorts of Wills. The first, a Natural Will, which he calls *Θέλησις*, being Nothing but a Desire of doing a Thing, without any Reason for it. The second, a General Will, by him called *Βούλησις*, being an Effect of Reason. The third, called *Γνώμη*, is an Inclination to one Thing rather than another. The fourth, is the Choice one makes of one Thing rather than another. The fifth is the Determination of the Will to do this or that Thing. And lastly, the Execution. The Matter being thus stated, he says, that our Saviour had unquestionably a general Will attended with Reasoning, but that he has not a Will of Choice, nor of Deliberation or Design to do one Thing rather than another, because having a perfect Knowledge of all Things by his Nature by reason of the Hypostatical Union, and his Humane Will being wholly subject to the Divine Will, he cannot deliberate upon what he must do, nor will any Thing but what pleases the Divine Will. That there being two Natures in Christ, there ought to be likewise two Wills, that is to say, two Faculties; but by reason there is but one Hypostasis, or but one Person that wills, he therefore wills but one Thing, and has but one general Will, that is, but one sole Affection, because the Humane Will does in all Things concur with the Divine Will. This is the Opinion of Photius in this Matter, which he backs with many Reasons; and gives shrewd Answers to all Objections against it.

Photius's
Sermons.

Photius's
Treatises
concerning
the Will
of Christ.

Of the
Contest
between
Photius
and
Ignatius.
Photius's
Theological
Treatises.

In the fifth Tome of *Canisius* we find moreover, seven short Dissertations of *Photius*, upon several Scholastick Questions. In the first he puts this Question, How God is every where? and answers the Objections made against his Omnipresence. He shews, that God is not in the World as created Beings are, but in a more sublime Manner; that he is in every Thing, and above all Things; that he is in all Things by his Operation, but that his Act being his Substance, one may truly say, that he is both in Act and Substance every where; that he is every where, without being of the same Substance with the Things in which he is; that he makes no Part of them, not being tied, mingled, confounded, or any way changed by them.

In the second Dissertation he shews how we know God in this Life; and says, that we cannot perfectly define, or know him, but that he is known to us by a small Beam of his Majesty shining upon his Creatures, and by way of Negation, that is, by denying that he is any of those Things we see. That all Men naturally know, that there is a God; because there ought to be an Eternal Being, a Sovereign Lord of all Things, and a Supreme Good by his own proper Substance.

In the third Dissertation he explains the Terms proper to the Divine Nature, both in Common, and such as are proper to each Person.

In the fourth he shews how we may say, that God is one, and that there are three Persons in the God-head.

In the fifth he treats of the Mystery of the Incarnation, and shews, that though the Word be every where, yet 'tis united hypostatically only to the Humane Nature he took upon him.

In the sixth he brings in the Reasons, why it was expedient the Word should become Man. The first is, That Men being led by their Senses, might be raised by the Sight of his Humane Nature to the Knowledge of a Deity. The second, Because our Saviour had not overcome the Devil, had he not been in a Condition to suffer. The third is, Because when a Man does both preach and give good Example, it is more effectual than using the Ministry of others; and that it is easier to imitate the Virtues we see practised, than those the Practice whereof is required, without giving a Model of them. Thus it was requisite, that God should assume our Nature, to preach unto us himself the true saving Doctrine, and by teaching us by his own Example the Practice of Virtues, to set himself up for a Model thereof.

Manu-
scripts of
Photius.

In the Libraries of *Ansburg*, the *Vatican*, and of *Monseigneur Colbert*, there are Manuscripts of a Treatise of *Photius*, intituled *Amphilochia*, from the Name of *Amphilochius* Bishop of *Cyzicus*, who had proposed unto him a hundred Questions, which he solves in this Answer. [Some Fragments of this Treatise are extant at the End of *Amphilochius's* Works, printed by *Father Combefis* at *Paris* in 1644. and in his *Auctuar*. Tom. I. and by *Turrian* and others.] This Book was never yet in Print, nor these following Works of *Photius*, viz. his Commentary upon *St. Paul's* Epistles, of which there is a Manuscript extant in the Publick Library of *Cambridge* [but defective;] his Notes upon the Prophets, to be found in the *Vatican* Library; a Treatise against

an Heretick, called *Leontius*, Bishop of *Antioch*, and quoted by *Stidas* [in the Word *Leontius*.] To which add a Treatise against the *Latins*; [a Fragment of which is extant in *Bishop Usher, de Symbolis*, p. 25.] a Collection upon the Rights of the Metropolitans and Bishops, with a *Lexicon*; a Commentary upon *Aristotle's Categories*; and some other Works, which never yet saw Light.

We have Nothing to add to what has been already said, concerning the Learning, the happy Genius, and sublime Qualifications of *Photius*. Had he made use of 'em for the Good of the Church, and not corrupted them by his unjust Attempts, by unheard-of Violences, by Tricks and Artifices unworthy of an honest Man, he might have been happy. But his excessive Love of Glory, and his unbounded Ambition, prompted him to those Excesses, which have blasted all his Endowments. 'Tis needless to repeat what we have already said of the various Editions of his Works: But it were to be wished, that we had a new Edition larger, and more correct.

Having spoken hitherto of *Photius's* Writings, I shall add a Word of *Theodorus Abucara*, supposed to be that Metropolitan of the Province of *Caria*, who was ordained by *Methodius*: Who, having sided with *Photius*, acknowledged his Fault in the eighth Council, at their second Session; and was received with the other Bishops ordained by *Methodius*, who left *Photius* to submit to *Ignatius*. We have, under his Name, many small Doctrinal Treatises, published both in *Greek* and *Latin* by *Gretzerus*, and printed at *Ingolstadt* in 1606. together with a Treatise of *Anastasius Sinaita*, intituled, *ὁδὸς*; or, *A Guide to the Right Way*. As also in *Auctuario Duceano*, at *Paris*, 1624. Tom. 1. p. 367.]

The Works of this Author are almost all composed by Way of Dialogues; wherein he brings in a Christian speaking with *Infidels*, *Saracens*, *Jews* and *Nestorians*, whom he teaches the Truths of our Christian Faith, and answers their Objections. Therein he handles several Scholastick Questions upon the Mysteries of the Christian Religion, and expounds the Meaning of the Philosophers Terms, which they made use of to explain them. He insists particularly upon the Trinity, and the Incarnation. Having, by Natural Reasons proved God's Existence, he endeavours to prove the Trinity after the same Manner. He shews, That Christ is the Messias; tells the Infidels, That he is God; and demonstrates *Mahomet* to be an Impostor. He proves the Necessity, and explains the Effects of the Incarnation; confutes the Errors of the *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Jacobites*, and *Theopaschites* in that Point; and proves, that there is in Christ but one Hypostasis, and two Natures. In his Answer to the *Saracens* Question upon the Eucharist, he says, in plain Terms, That the Bread and Wine set by the Priest upon the Holy Table, are changed by the Descent of the Holy Ghost into the Body and Blood of our Saviour. He confutes the Error of the *Origenists*, as to the Duration of the Pains inflicted upon the Damned. He shews, against the *Saracens*, that it is more decent and rational to have but one Wife, than many. He shews, That God is by no Means the Author of Evil. He affirms, That the Blessed Virgin never died. Lastly, he treats of several of the most subtle Questions of Divinity.

Theodo-
rus Abu-
cara.

A Censure
upon the
Genius and
Qualifica-
tions of
Photius.

CHAP. X.

An Account of the Controversies raised by Photius, with the Church of Rome.

Controver-
sies raised
by Photius
with the
Church of
Rome.

Photius was not satisfy'd with having divided the *Greek* Church by his Ambition, and laid the Foundations of a Division between the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, but he also opposed the latter about several Points of Doctrine and Discipline, contain'd in a Letter which he writ against it. Pope *Nicholas* the I. seeing himself so vigorously attack'd, desir'd the Assistance of the Bishops and Clergy of *France*, to answer the Objections of *Photius*; and sent to *Hincmarus*, and the other Archbishops of *Charles's* Kingdom, the ten chief Heads objected against the *Latin* Church; that when they had examin'd them, they might furnish him with suitable Answers. *Odo*, Bishop of *Beauvais*, was pitch'd upon by the Bishops of the Province of *Rheims*, to make a Collection of the Answers which they thought sufficient to obviate the Objections of the *Greeks*. *Aeneas*, Bishop of *Paris*, was chosen for the same Matter by the Bishops of the Province of *Sens*. We have the Treatise of the last; *Odo's* is lost; unless some will say, That 'tis the Treatise of *Ratramnus*, which *Odo* put out in his Name. But, there is more Likelihood, that the Bishops also order'd *Ratramnus* to write on that Subject; for, he ends his Work with these Words; *We have treated as well as we could on those Matters, contain'd in the Writings you sent to us. If our Answer please you, we give God Thanks; and, if it displease you, we submit it to your Censure and Correction*: Which Words were, in all Probability, addressed to the Bishops, who had given him Orders to write on this Subject.

The Charge of the *Greeks* consisted of ten Articles, which *Ratramnus* and *Aeneas* answer in their Works.

Ratramnus's Preface is very short: He says, That the Objections made by the Emperors, *Michael* and *Basil*, against the *Roman* Church, are either False, Heretical, Superstitious, or Irreligious; and ought to be condemn'd, were it not, that they give an Offence to the Weak. *Aeneas's* Preface is a great deal longer. He begins it with an *Encomium* of the Church, which is always victorious over her Enemies; and then he laments the Division which was growing up between the Churches; for the *Greeks* had begun to attack the *Roman* Church in the Reign of *Lewis the Godly*. He adds, That almost all the Heresies were hatch'd in *Greece*; that oftentimes the Eastern Patriarchs were Hereticks; but, that the *Roman* Church was so happy, as never to have had an Author of Heresie for its Bishop: That indeed *Liberius* yielded to the Violence of the *Arians*, but did not altogether forsake the Faith of the Church. That the Objections which the *Greeks* make at present, are unjust; that they start unnecessary Questions, which are like to be the Occasion of Trouble and Scandal; that he is oblig'd to prepare to answer and refute 'em.

The first chief Objection of the *Greeks* is concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost. The *Greeks* ask the *Romans*, Heads of Why they hold that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, and not from the Father alone? As this is the principal Head, and a Fundamental Point, *Ratramnus* treats of

Controver-
sies raised
by Photius
with the
Church of
Rome.

Answers

to the
Accusation
of the
Greeks.

it very fully; and, of the four Books which compleat his Work, three are entirely written on this Subject. In the first he proves the Doctrine of the *Romans*, by several Texts of Scripture; and, in the two other, he urges some Passages of the Fathers. *Aeneas* only collects those Passages of the Fathers, which confirm the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son.

Ratramnus observes, in the Beginning of his fourth Book, that the other Heads of the Exceptions, made by the *Greeks*, don't at all concern Matters of Faith, but merely the Ceremonies and Usages of the Church, inasmuch, that it had been better not to have mention'd 'em; since no Man is either oblig'd to approve of 'em, or reject them; for, the Ceremonies of the Churches may be different; which he proves by the Practices of the Primitive Church, which made use of others, than what have been since practis'd, and by the various Customs of the Churches among themselves, concerning which he cites the Passage of *Socrates*: Whence he concludes, that it is without Cause, that the *Greeks* inveigh against the Ceremonies of the *Latins*, for differing from theirs; observing, that this Exception cou'd not proceed from a Motive of Piety, but from Envy or Pride. After this general Observation, which *Aeneas* has not made, he examines distinctly the Exceptions of the *Greeks*, against every Article of Discipline.

The first, in *Ratramnus*, which is the second in *Aeneas*, is concerning the Fast on *Saturdays*. *Ratramnus* observes, That all the Western Churches do not agree with the Church of *Rome* in this Article; and that the Number of those Churches, who do not fast on *Saturdays*, is greater than of those, who keep this Fast: Besides, that all the Eastern Churches do not abstain from Fasting; since, in the Church of *Alexandria*, they dine not on this day, no more than in the Church of *Rome*. He says, That the Custom of Fasting on *Saturdays* is of long standing in the Church of *Rome*; and he deduces the Original of it from *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, who, 'tis said, fasted on this day, before they undertook the Dispute with *Simon Magus*; whence, 'tis thought, this Custom among the *Romans* came. He grounds this Assertion on a Passage in the Life of *St. Sylvester*, of which he will have *Eusebius* to be the Author: But this Apocryphal Work does not so well justify the Practice of the *Roman* Church, as the Passages in *St. Augustine* about this Fast, and the Reflections that he makes on the Liberty which the Churches ought to have of following their Ancient Customs. *Aeneas* justifies the Practice of the Church of *Rome* by the Testimonies of *Pope Innocent* the I. of *St. Hierome* and *St. Isidore*.

The second Article of Discipline, which is of like Nature with this, is concerning the Length of the Lent-Fast. The *Greeks* were offended, that the *Latins* did not fast eight whole Weeks, during which they were to abstain from eating Flesh, and, during seven Weeks, from Eggs and Cheese. *Ratramnus* answers, That there is a great deal of Difference, as well in the Eastern, as the Western Churches, about the Number of Weeks in Lent; that some begin it six, some seven, others eight, and others even nine Weeks before *Easter*: That if the Fast were to be kept exactly forty days, those who fast all the other days, except *Sundays*, must fast also four days of the seventh Week: That they who fast not on *Saturdays*, or *Sundays*, ought to begin their Fast the eighth Week; and that those who likewise, except *Thursdays*, ought to begin nine Weeks before *Easter*, to make up the Number of forty days; and, in fine, that the *Roman* Church begins a Kind of Fast nine Weeks before *Easter*, as well as the *Greek* Church, in that they leave off singing of *Hallelujah* nine Weeks before *Easter*: But, after all, though there are some Western Churches that fast no more than six Weeks before *Easter*, except *Sundays*, and in which, by Consequence, there are but thirty six days of Fasting; nevertheless, for the most Part, there are added four days of Fasting in the seventh Week before *Easter*, and that thus they fast more exactly than the *Greeks*, who keep but half a Fast in the first Week, since they do not abstain from Things made of Milk; and in the seven others are three Days in each Week without Fasting, so that thus they fast but 36 Days. *Aeneas* says the same in his Answer; but he observes farther, that this Kind of Abstinence is various in different Churches; that in *Egypt* and *Palestine* they fast nine Weeks before *Easter*; that in several Parts of *Italy*, three days in a Week they abstain from eating any boil'd, bak'd, or roasted Meat, their Meals being only of Fruits, Herbs and Pulse; that in *Germany* they don't usually abstain from Milk, Butter, Cheese, and Eggs; that some do not fast on Holy *Thursday*; and that the *Roman* Church seems more reasonable in fasting six Weeks together, except *Sundays*, and in adding four days to compleat the Number of forty days of Fasting.

The fourth Objection made by the *Greeks* is of very little Consequence, as *Ratramnus* observes. They are offended that the Priests shave their Beards. *Ratramnus* makes this appear to be a Matter of no Moment, which wholly depends upon Custom: That some do not shave their Beards,

but cut the Hair of their Heads; That others shave their Beards, and the Crowns of their Heads, letting the Hair grow that is about their Temples, and the under-part of their Heads; That others shave off one Part of their Hair, and keep on the other: In fine, That the Custom of the Clergy is not uniform in this Matter, but different; and that there had never been any Dispute on this Occasion; that the Apostle *St. Paul* seems to condemn those Men, who, in shaving their Heads, put themselves under a Necessity of covering them with a Veil: That nevertheless they are not to be blam'd, who do it out of Humility: That he does not accuse the *Greeks*, nor should they find Fault with the Custom of the *Latins*, who imitate the *Nazarites*, in shaving their Beards, and cutting their Hair. *Aeneas* makes use of this Example, and of some Passages in the Fathers that speak of it, to justify the Custom of the *Romans*; and adds, That it might more reasonably be objected to the *Greeks* as a Fault, that they suffer their Hair to grow, & sic comam nutrant, against the Prohibition made by the Apostle and the Church.

The fifth Article is concerning the Celibacy of Priests. *Ratramnus* says, That if the *Greeks* seem'd superstitious in the other Objections, they are either very blind, or were worthy of Compassion in this; blind, if they do not see that Continency is very much to be commended in Ministers of the Altar; and, worthy of Compassion, if, knowing it, they condemn what they are sensible in their own Consciences deserves to be prais'd. He makes it appear, that the *Latins* do not by this condemn Marriage; but that they prefer Continency, and esteem it more becoming Priests, who ought only to be taken up with Divine Service. Then he quotes some Canons, which oblige Bishops and Priests to Continence. *Aeneas*, after he has alledg'd the Texts of *St. Paul*, in Praise of Celibacy, cites the Canons of Councils, Decretals of Popes, and Passages of Fathers, in Favour of Celibacy.

The sixth Article is touching the Prohibition to Priests of the *Roman* Church, to anoint the Foreheads of those that are baptiz'd with Chrism. *Ratramnus* says, That there is no better Ground for this Objection, than for the other; since the *Greeks* have no other Reason for doing it, besides the Custom of their Church, and no Law at all. On the contrary he maintains, that the Custom of the *Romans* is grounded upon the Gospel, and the Acts of the Apostles, where the Imposition of Hands, for bestowing of the Holy Ghost, is reserv'd to the Apostles, and consequently to Bishops, who are much above Priests, and who have particular Offices, as conferring Holy Orders, consecrating the Holy Chrism, Holy Oils, &c. He adds, That it was upon the Account of their Dignity, that it was forbidden to Priests to anoint the Forehead of the Baptiz'd with Holy Chrism. He affirms, That this was establish'd by *St. Sylvester*, as it is written in the Pontifical, and quotes a Passage of *Pope Innocent* on this Subject. These two Authorities are likewise urg'd by *Aeneas*, with a Passage of *Gelasius*.

The seventh Objection which the *Greeks* make against the *Latins*, is false in Matter of Fact; They charge 'em with ordaining Bishops and Deacons, without conferring on them the Order of Priesthood. *Ratramnus* denies that this is practis'd in the West. He owns, that their Deacons are chosen in order to be made Bishops; but, he makes it appear, that this is not contrary to the Canons of the Church; whereas the *Greeks* violate 'em, in choosing Laymen to make 'em Bishops. *Aeneas* does not absolutely deny, that there are some among the *Latins* who allow of this Ordination; but he excuses their Practice upon this Account, that it seems that he, who receives the Pontifical Benediction, is likewise honour'd with the other Benedictions, and that (it may be) they believ'd, according to *St. Jerome*, that the Ministry of a Priest makes Part of a Bishop, on which he quotes the Passage in *St. Jerome* on the Epistle of *Titus*.

The eighth Objection of the *Greeks* is against the Primacy of the Patriarch of *Rome*, to whom they wou'd prefer, or at least equalize the Patriarch of *Constantinople*; because that City was then equal, if not superior to *Rome*. *Ratramnus* asserts this Primacy, because *Jesus Christ*, who is the Head of the whole Church, said to *St. Peter*, *Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church*: And *St. Paul* tells us, *That he was among the Gentiles*, as *St. Peter* among the Jews: That these two Apostles having receiv'd of *Jesus Christ* the Supremacy of the Church, *Quos ambos Ecclesie Principatum a Christo positos*, were sent to *Rome*, as appears both by undoubted History, and by the Monuments of their Martyrdom: That it was reasonable, that the Prince of the Apostles should be sent to the chief City of the World, to the end, that as it had subdued all the World to its Empire, it should likewise preside over all the Kingdoms of the World, by its Primacy of Religion, and the Dignity of Apostleship. He alledges some Passages of Councils and Popes to establish this Preheminence of the Church of *Rome*. He affirms, That the Popes were always Presidents at General Councils by their Legates. He makes it appear, that the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, is neither to be preferred, nor

nor equalled with that of *Rome*; and that he ought to be satisfied with the second Place, which was allowed him by the Council of *Constantinople*, without entrencing on the Rights of other Churches, and the Determination made by the Council of *Nice*. *Aeneas* makes a Collection of the Canons of some Councils, and the Decretals of Popes about Rome.

He quotes some spurious Tracts attributed to St. *Sylvester*, as also the Donation of *Constantine*, and ends his Treatise with an Invektive against the Condemnation of *Ignatius*, and the Advancement of *Photius* to the Patriarchate of the Church of *Constantinople*.

The *Greeks* made two more Objections against the *Latins*, which these two Authors think not worth their Answering,

because they plainly appear to be false; however, they ought not to be forgotten. The first is, that they made use of River-Water to make the Chrism. The second is, that they offer'd a Lamb at *Easter* with the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, according to the Custom of the *Jews*. *Walafridus* with the *Strabo* relates, that there were some particular Persons, who consecrated and offer'd a Lamb at *Easter*. An Example of this Usage is found in the Life of St. *Uldarick*, and a Prayer is to be seen in the *Roman* Order; for the Benediction of the Lamb on *Easter*-day; but this was not a general Custom, nor authoriz'd by all the *Latin* Churches. There is much more of Argument in *Ratramnus's* Work than in *Aeneas's*, which is little else but a Collection of Passages on the Questions propos'd.

CHAP. XI.

Several Constitutions made in Ecclesiastical Assemblies, about the Discipline of the Church.

NO Princes and Bishops were ever so careful in making Rules for the Discipline of the Church, nor have so frequently renew'd and confirm'd them,

as the Kings and Bishops of *France* in the ninth Century. These Rules were made by them in several Assemblies, of which here follows a particular Account.

The Council of Aix la Chapelle, held in 809.

IN this Council the Question about the Procession of the Holy Ghost was debated, which was started by a Monk of *Jerusalem*, called *John*; and, it was there determin'd, That he proceeded from the Father and the Son: And, to confirm this Determination, *Charles the Great* wrote a Letter to Pope *Leo* the Third, in which he confirms this Doctrine by many Passages out of the Fathers. He also sent *Bernarius*, Bishop of *Wormes*, *Jesse*, Bishop of *Amiens*, and *Adelardus* Abbot of *Corbey*, to that Pope, to oblige him to confirm this Definition, and to allow that

the Creed might be sung with the Addition of the *Filioque*. A Part of the Conference, which these Deputies had with *Leo* on that Subject, is yet extant; by which it is evident, that this Pope did allow of their Definition; but that he was not pleas'd with this Addition made to the Creed, or that it should be sung with it. It was also propos'd in this Council, to make some Orders concerning the Discipline of the Church, and the Lives of the Clergy, but it was not put in Execution.

The Sixth Council of Arles, in the Year 813.

IN the Year 813, *Charles the Great* assembled several Councils for the Reformation of the Church, design'd in the Council of *Aix la Chapelle*; *Eginard* speaks of five; one held at *Mentz*, another at *Rheims*, a third at *Tours*, the fourth at *Chalons*, and the last at *Arles*: In this Order these Councils are reckon'd by this Author and *Reginon*. Nevertheless, that of *Arles*, and that of *Rheims*, are dated in the Month of *May*; and that of *Mentz* not till *June*; and, the two others have no Date at all. We follow the Order in which they are found in the Collection of Councils, among which the Council of *Arles* is the first. The Bishops met in St. *Stephen's* Church at *Arles*, on the 10th. of *May*, and after they had taken their Places, according to the Time of their Ordination, and prayed for the Emperor *Charles*, who had assembled them; *John*, Archbishop of *Arles*, and *Hebridus*, Archbishop of *Narbonne*, who were the Emperor's Deputies, told them, That his Majesty earnestly pray'd and desir'd them to instruct the Churches that were committed to their Charge, with Saving Doctrines, and to be exemplary to them for the Sanctity of their Lives and Manners. They added, That in Acknowledgment of the King's Kindness and Favours, it was fit that Prayers should be order'd to be daily made in the Church for the Health and Prosperity of his Majesty. The next day the Bishops being met again, began their Constitutions with a Profession of Faith: Then they order'd, that Prayers should be made for the Emperor, which were the two first Articles of this Council. In the third, the Metropolitans were order'd to take Care, that their Suffragans should be well instructed in Sacred Things; that they should understand what belonged to Baptism, the Holy Scripture, and the Canons, that they might be able to teach, preach to, and edify all the World by their Knowledge and Piety. In the fourth, the Laity is forbidden to turn the Priests out of their Churches, without the Bishop's Sentence, who ought not to prefer them to any Churches, unless he be well assur'd of their Capacity. The fifth forbids the Laity to take Bribes of Priests for presenting them to Churches. The sixth enjoins Bishops to regulate the Lives of Monks and Canons. The seventh says, That none but Persons of known Honesty, and of

considerable Age, shall have Leave to come into Nunneries; and that those who shall come in there to celebrate Divine Service, shall withdraw as soon as it is over; That neither young Clerks, nor Monks, shall be permitted to come thither, unless it be to see some of their Relations. The eighth ordains, That no Monastery shall receive a greater Number of Maids than it can maintain. The ninth, That Tithes shall be paid: The tenth, That the Rectors and Vicars shall take Care to preach to and instruct their Congregations. The eleventh forbids Marriages between Relations. The twelfth recommends Peace and Unity. The thirteenth, Obedience to the Bishops, and Concord between Priests and the Civil Magistracy. The fourteenth regards the Relief of the Poor in Time of Famine. The fifteenth is against false Measures. The sixteenth forbids keeping Markets on *Sundays*, and working in servile Employments. The seventeenth enjoins Bishops to visit their Dioceses every Year, and to hinder Oppression and Violence. The eighteenth commands, that Priests shall keep the Holy Chrism under Lock and Key; that they shall give none of it to any Person as a Medicine, or for any other Reason whatever; because it is a Kind of Sacrament which ought not to be touch'd but by the Priests. The nineteenth recommends to Fathers and Godfathers Care of the Instruction and Education of their Children, both Natural and Spiritual. The twentieth declares, that the Churches shall not be depriv'd of their Tythes, nor of the Goods belonging to them. The one and twentieth forbids Burials in Churches. The two and twentieth ordains, that no Pleadings nor Assemblies shall be held in Churches, or in the Porches of Churches. The twenty third is to prevent the Frauds and Cheats that are us'd in the Sale of the Goods of the Poor. The twenty fourth forbids Bishops to permit any strange or fugitive Priests in their Dioceses, and enjoins 'em to send 'em back to their own Bishops. The twenty fifth orders, that those who hold any Benefices, or have Goods belonging to Churches, shall be obliged to contribute to the Repairing of those Churches. The twenty sixth, that Publick Sinners shall do Publick Penance.

The Council of Mentz, in the same Year.

The Council of Mentz.

THis Council was more famous and numerous than the preceding, and made more Canons: It was holden in St. Alban's Church, the 8th. of June, in the Year 813. There were four Deputies from the Emperor present at it, *Hildebrand, Riculphus, Arnoldus, and Bernarius*. The Assembly divided themselves into three Classes: The Bishops made up the first, who had before them the Holy Scripture, the Canons, and the *Pastoral* of St. Gregory: The second consisted of Abbots and Monks, who examined the Rule of St. *Benedict*. The last was composed of Noblemen and Judges, who consider'd what concern'd the Civil Government. After a Fast of three days, they made fifty six Canons. In the three first they speak of the three Virtues, *Faith, Hope and Charity*. In the fourth it is ordain'd, That Baptism should be administred, according to the *Roman* Ritual, and that it shall not be administred, but at *Easter*, or *Whitsuntide*, unless there be a Necessity for it. The three following Canons are for settling Peace, and to prevent the taking away another Man's Goods unjustly. The eighth grants to the Bishop the Disposol of the Revenues belonging to the Church. The ninth, and the following, contain several Orders concerning the Lives of Prebendaries and Monks, to whom they prohibit Worldly Pleasures, and the Secular Employment. The Prebendaries or *Canons* are there distinguish'd from the Monks, and the *Canonesse*s from the Nuns, who are of the Order of St. *Benedict*. The two and twentieth is against Vagabond Clerks. The three and twentieth sets at Liberty the Clerks and Monks who have been shav'd, and cloyster'd by Force. The twenty fifth enjoyns Bishops to appoint some others to preach in their Stead, when they can't perform this Duty. The twenty eighth commands Priests to wear Stoles always as Bidges of the Sacerdotal Office. The thirty second and thirty third recommend the Observance of Litanies, or of Rogations. The thirty fifth that of Ember-weeks. The thirty sixth the Celebration of High Holy-days, which are *Easter-*

day, and all the Week, *Ascension-day, Whitsuntide*, the Feasts, of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, the Nativity of St. *John*, the Assumption of the Virgin *Mary*, the Dedication of St. *Michael*, the Holy-days of St. *Remigius*, St. *Martin*, and St. *Mentz*. *Andrew*; Four days at *Christmas*, and the Octave of *Christmas-day*, the *Epiphany*, the *Purification*, with the Holy-days of *Martyrs* and *Confessors*, in each Diocels, where the Body of any one of them lies, and the Day of the Dedication of the Church. The fortieth maintains the ancient Right of Churches, in being made Sanctuaries, and forbids that those shall be deliver'd up, who come thither for Refuge, till their Lives are secur'd. The three and fortieth declares, that one Priest cannot sing Mass alone. The four and fortieth reminds the People, that they ought to make frequent Offerings in the Church, and to give one another *Pax*. The five and fortieth exhorts the Faithful to be careful in the Instruction of their Children. The six and fortieth threatens those with Excommunication, who shall not refrain from Drunkenness. The eight and fortieth forbids the singing any lewd or immodest Songs, in going round any Churches. The fiftieth appoints the Titles of the *Vidames*, and Defenders, or other Officers of Bishops, Abbots, or their Clergymen. The one and fiftieth forbids the Translation of Reliques without Leave. The four and fiftieth orders, that Relations in the fourth Degree shall not be allow'd to join in Matrimony. The five and fiftieth forbids Parents presenting their own Children at the Font, or marrying one's God-daughter, or one's Partner in the Suretyship at a Child's Baptism, or even the Person, whose Son or Daughter one has brought to be confirm'd. I have omitted some Canons that are mention'd in the foregoing Council.

Vidames] were such Persons, as supplied the Bishops Places, as Temporal Lords: *Judges* of Bishops Temporal Jurisdiction. Now they are become Lords, holding of the Bishoprick they belong to.

The Council of Rheims, in the same Year.

Of Rheims

After a Profession of Faith had been drawn up in this Council, and the Clergy had been admonish'd to do their Duty, the Gospel was read. The Manner of celebrating the Divine Service, and of administering Baptism, was explain'd. The Canons, the Rule prescribed by St. *Benedict*, the Book written by St. *Gregory*, concerning the Duty of Pastors, and some Sentences out of the Fathers were read. What relates to Penance was examin'd, that the Priests might know how they were to hear Confessions, and what Penances they were to enjoyn. Eight of the chief Vices were also discours'd of in this Council; and the Bishops were told what they ought to

study, and how they should preach. They were directed to lead a chaste, sober, and modest Life, and to do Justice. As for Priests, they were enjoyn'd not to remove from a manner Benefice to one that was greater; and it was order'd, that such as should obtain any by Presents, or Money, should be depos'd. Several Canons were made concerning the Lives of Clergymen and Monks, as also concerning the Preservation of the Goods of the Church, and the Keeping the Sabbath-day holy. This is all that is contain'd in the four and forty Articles, or Canons of this Council, which are nothing but the Summary or Abridgment of the Matters that were transacted there.

The third Council of Tours, in the same Year.

Of Tours.

THE Prelates of the Province of *Tours* took no less Care than the other Bishops to reform the Lives of the Clergy, and the Discipline of the Church. In a Council that was conven'd in that Town, in the same Year 813. they made fifty one Canons upon the same Subjects. The Bishops are charg'd by them, to instruct themselves and others; to lead a sober, modest Life; to

abstain from Games, Shows, and Hunting; to take Care of the Poor, &c. The same is enjoyn'd the Priests, and other Clergymen. 'Tis forbidden to bestow the Order of Knighthood on any Man, before he be thirty Years of Age. In short, most of the Canons mention'd in the foregoing Councils are treated of in this.

The second Council of Chalons, in the same Year.

Of Chalons.

THis Council is the best of the five, held that Year by *Charles the Great's* Order, for reforming the Church, and particularly the Clergy; but it is the most considerable for the Number of Canons, and for the Matters of which it treats. In the first Canon, it condemns, with a great Deal of Strictness, the Avarice, sordid Gain, and Exactions of the Bishops, and other Clergymen. Among other Things, it enjoyns the Bishops not to be a Charge to the Rectors of Parishes in their Visitations; and their Archdeacons not to demand of them any Fees, or any Thing for the Holy Chrism. It will not have them to oblige the Clerks, whom they ordain, to swear that they are worthy, nor that they will never do any Thing contrary to the Canons, and will be obedient to their Ordinaries. It does not prescribe many Things to the Monks, because it observes, that those of that Province are to follow St. *Benedict's* Rule, and consequently need but keep exactly to their Rule to live as they ought. It requires the Re-establishing of Publick Penance, for Publick Sins. To stop, or prevent the Differences that happen among Heirs, concerning the Right of Patronage of a Church, it orders, that it shall not be divided, and that none of the Clergy, nam'd by different Heirs, shall be suffer'd to perform their Function there, till

they are agreed together, and have elected one and no more. Some Persons were so devout as to be confirm'd many Times; this Council forbids this Abuse in the 27th. Canon. In the 30th. it is forbidden to dissolve the Marriages of Slaves. Some Women, with a Design of being divorc'd from their Husbands, brought their Children, at the Administration of Baptism, or Confirmation: Now, this Council orders, that these Women shall be oblig'd to do Penance, and not be divorc'd. The 32d. intimates, that we ought not to make Confession of our Corporeal Sins only, but also of the Spiritual. These are the Words of the 33d. *Some say, That we ought to confess our Sins to God alone; others affirm, That they ought to be confess'd to Priests: Both are done with great Benefit in the Holy Church; so that we confess our Sins to God, who does forgive them; and, according to the Apostle's Institution, we confess them to each other, and pray for each other, that we may be sav'd. So the Confession which is made to God purges from Sin; and that which is made to the Priest, informs us, how we ought to be purged from them: For, God is the Author of our Salvation, and grants it us, sometimes in an invisible Manner, by his Omnipotence, and sometimes by the Operation of Physicians. Which Canon only proves, that the Confession which is made to Priests ought to be attended with*

The second Council of Chalons. with an humble Confession of Sins to God; or, it is to be only understood of Venial Sins; it being certain, that it is necessary, that Mortal Sins be confess'd to Priests, that we may obtain a Forgiveness of those Sins. This Council, in the next Canon, exhorts the Priests to act like Physicians, and like Judges, and to enjoyn *Salutary* and Suitable Penances to Sinners. It lets Penitents know, after this, that *Repentance*, if it be true, ought to be attended with a Change, both in the Heart, and Course of Life. It enjoyns all Confessors to take their Measures, concerning the Injunction of Penances, from the Holy Writ, and the Canons, or from the Custom of the Church; and, to reject such *Penitential Books*, the Errors of which are unquestionable, and their Authors uncertain, which have occasion'd the Death of many, because they only enjoyn slight Penances for great Sins. In the nine and thirtieth Canon it is order'd, that Prayers be said for the Dead at every Mass. The fortieth orders, that such Clergymen as have been; or shall be degraded for their Crimes, be shut up in Monasteries, that they may lead there a Penitent Life. The one and fortieth is against such Priests as change their Church. The two and fortieth is against those who give Churches to Priests, or take Churches from them, without the Consent of the Bishops. The three and fortieth is against certain *Irish men*, who giving themselves out to be Bishops, did ordain Priests and Deacons, without the Consent of the Ordinaries: Their Ordinations are here declared to be void. The four and fortieth is against those Priests, that follow such Trades as are forbidden them. The five and fortieth is against those who go in Pilgrimage to *Rome* or *Tours*, thinking, by this means, to obtain more easily the Remission of their Sins; and who, in hopes of this, the more freely commit them: But the Council approves the Piety

The second Council of Chalons. of those, who, having first confess'd their Sins at the Place of their Abode, and there done Penance, and begun a new Course of Life, go afterwards in Pilgrimage, by a Motive of real Devotion, and with a sincere Design of expiating their Sins. The six and fortieth imports, that a great Deal of Caution ought to be us'd in what relates to the Receiving of the Body and Blood of Christ. That 'tis to be fear'd on one side, if it be too long put off, this Delay should occasion the Loss of the Soul; but that on the other side, if 'tis receiv'd unworthily, not considering the Lord's Body, those that receive, are like to eat and drink their own Damnation. So that all Persons ought to try, and examine themselves before, abstaining, for some time, from Carnal Works, and cleansing the Body and the Soul. The seven and fortieth orders, that all *Christians* shall receive the Eucharist on Holy *Thursday*, except those to whom it is forbidden to take it, on the account of the great Crimes which they have committed. The eight and fortieth recommends the Anointing of the Sick, which ought to be perform'd by Priests, with an Oil consecrated by the Bishop; adding, that a Remedy so fit to cure the Infirmities of the Soul and the Body, ought not to be neglected. The nine and fortieth renews the Inhibition made by the Council of *Laodicea*, to celebrate the Sacrament in private Houses. The fiftieth orders the keeping of the Lord's Day Holy. The one and fiftieth recommends Charity between Superiors and Inferiors. The two and fiftieth commands the Abbesses to rule the Nuns committed to their Charge, with Holiness and Piety, and to be themselves a good Example to them. The following Canons are some Directions for Abbesses and Nunneries: There are, in all, sixty six Canons of this Council.

The Council of Aix la Chapelle, in the Year 816.

Of Aix la Chapelle. **L**ewis the Godly having conven'd a numerous Council at *Aix la Chapelle*, in the Year 816, caused two Rules to be drawn up there, by *Amalarius*, out of the Writings of the Holy Fathers, the one for the *Canons*, and the other for the *Canonesses*. They were read and approv'd in this Council; which order'd, they should be follow'd and practis'd by all *Canons* and *Canonesses*.

Of Aix la Chapelle. The Emperor confirm'd them with his own Authority, and sent Copies of them to the Bishops, that they might take Care to have them put in Execution. I do not here give the Abridgment of those two Rules, because they wholly consist of some Extracts of the Canons of the Councils, and of the Writings of the *Latin* Fathers.

The Council of Celichith in England, in the same Year.

Of Celichith. **T**Was not the *French* alone that were endeavouring to reform the Discipline of the Church; the *English*, mov'd by their Example, did the like. *Ken-wolfe*, King of the *Mercians*, caus'd a Council to meet in the same Year 816; The Archbishop of *Canterbury* presided in it, and twelve Bishops of the different Kingdoms in *England* were present; eleven Canons were made in it: In the first, the Bishops declare, that they will preserve the Faith and Orthodox Doctrine in their Purity, which they receiv'd from their Fathers. In the second they say, that when a Church is built, it ought to be consecrated by the Bishop of the Diocese; that afterwards the Eucharist ought to be set there, with Relicks in a Chest; and that 'tis requisite the Figure of the Saint to whom it is dedicated, be placed in some Part of it. The third is an Exhortation to Concord and Unity among the Bishops. The fourth gives a Bishop Power to elect an Abbot, or Abbess, yet with the Advice and Consent of the Society. The fifth enjoyns that no *Irish men* be suffer'd to discharge any Ecclesiastical Function out of their own Country. The sixth confirms the Ancient Canons, and all Acts ratified and confirmed with the Sign of the Cross. The seventh is to

Of Celichith. prevent the Alienation of the Goods of the Church. The eighth charges Laicks, or Secular Persons, not to take Possession of Monasteries, or alter their Institution. The ninth directs each Bishop to have a Register, in which the Orders of the Synods, which he is to observe, are to be set down, with the Name of the Archbishop, on whom he depends, and of the other Bishops in the Province. The tenth imports, that after the Death of a Bishop, the tenth Part of his Estate shall be distributed to the Poor, or to pious Uses; and that Prayers shall be said for him throughout his whole Diocese, that he may obtain the Kingdom of Heaven, and dwell with the Saints. The eleventh orders the Bishops to do Nothing in the Dioceses of their Brethren without their Leave. The Archbishop is excepted, because he is the Head of the Bishops. It charges the Priests not to perform any other Functions than such as are left to them by the Bishops, as that of baptizing, and giving the Extreme Unction. It establishes some Penalties against those that did neglect to administer Baptism; and finally it orders, that this Sacrament shall not be perform'd by sprinkling, but by dipping.

The Council of Aix la Chapelle, in the Year 817.

Of Aix la Chapelle. **I**N the following Year *Lewis the Godly* held an Assembly of Abbots and Monks at *Aix la Chapelle*, and caused some Constitutions for Monks to be prepar'd by *Benedict of Aniane*, charging that Abbot to see

Of Aix la Chapelle. them kept. These Constitutions are eighty in all. An Account of Abbies, and of what they were to pay to the Crown was also drawn up in that Assembly.

The Council of Thionville.

Of Thionville. **I**N the Year 821, there was an Assembly at *Thionville*, which made some Laws against those who should offer to misuse or beat a Clerk, and the Time for their Pe-

Of Thionville. nance is fixed. These Ecclesiastical Laws were confirm'd by an Edict of *Lewis the Godly*, which is at the End of them.

The Capitularies, or Sanctions of Lewis the Godly.

The Capitularies, or Sanctions of Lewis the Godly.

Lewis the Godly following his Father's pious Example, made several Laws, and wrote some Letters about Ecclesiastical Matters.

In the first Year of his Empire he pass'd an Edict in Favour of the *Spaniards* who fled into *France* from the Persecution of the *Saracens*. Another Edict made in his third Year, on the same Subject, is extant.

In the Year 816, he confirmed the Constitutions that were made at the Council of *Aix la Chapelle*, and gave Orders, that they should be follow'd by Letters to *Magnus*, Archbishop of *Sens*; to *Frotarius*, Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*; to *Arnoldus*, Archbishop of *Salsburgh*, and to other Metropolitans. In the same Year he also made twenty nine *Capitularies* on the Discipline of the Church. In the first he takes Care to secure to the Church those Revenues that belong to it. In the second, he leaves to the Clergy and the People the Liberty of choosing their own Bishops. In the third he confirms the Rules of Prebendaries. In the fourth he orders, that a good Use be made of the Oblations given at Church. In the fifth, he leaves to the Monks the Power of choosing their own Abbots. In the sixth, he forbids the conferring Holy Orders on Slaves. In the seventh, he enjoins the Clergy not to receive such Oblations, as might cause the Children, or Relations of those that make them, to be depriv'd of their Inheritance. In the eighth, the Priests are forbidden to give the *Tonsure* to any Person, with a Design to get a Part of his Estate. In the ninth, the Laity are charg'd not to turn the Priests out of their Churches, or install any there without the Bishop's Consent. In the tenth, he orders, that every Church have a Piece of Ground belonging to it, and that no Priests apply their Revenues but to the Service of the Church. In the eleventh, that every Church have its Priest: In the twelfth That the New Villages, where New Churches shall be built, pay Tythes to those Churches. The thirteenth forbids to pawn the Holy Vessels, unless it be for the Redemption of Captives. The sixteenth is against the *Simoniack* Exactions, that were practis'd by some Bishops of *Italy*. The seventeenth renews the Canon which forbids Priests to dwell with Women. In the eighteenth, 'tis ordered, that the Bishop shall send the *Chrism* to such Rectors of Parishes as are remote, by one of those in their Neighbourhood; but that all those who dwell but a League, or a League and a half out of Town, shall come to fetch it as usually. In the nineteenth, the Bishops are exhorted not to be a Charge to the People, when they go either to preach, or to confirm. In the twentieth 'tis decreed, that none presume to make young Maids, Nuns; or Boys, Monks; *i. e.* without the Consent of their Relations. The one and twentieth obliges Widows not to take the Veil, till thirty days after their Husbands Decease. The three following Canons are concerning Ravishers. The five and twentieth renews *Gelasius's* Canon, against those that either debauched any of the Virgins who had been consecrated to God, or ran away with them. In the six and twentieth 'tis enjoyn'd, that no Maid shall receive the Veil before she be five and twenty Years of Age, according to the Canons of *Africa*. The seven and twentieth forbids the *Trial* by the Cross. In the eight and twentieth, the Bishops are charg'd to instruct the People of their Dioceses. The last forbids Marriages between Relations, and the Sharing of Churches between Co-heirs, and promises to take Care to prevent this and many other Things.

In the Year 817, this Emperor published some Constitutions for the Monks; which Orders were drawn up at *Aix la Chapelle* by *Benedict of Aniane*.

Some mention an Edict of Confirmation made by *Lewis the Godly*, which, they say, he confirmed in Favour of Pope *Paschal II.* the pretended Donations made by his Father to the *Roman Church*; but that Piece plainly appears to be supposititious, and does not deserve the least Credit.

The *Capitularies* of the Year 819, are almost all of them Civil Laws. Some of them, nevertheless, relate to the Church; particularly the last *Capitulary*, published by *Baluzius*, page 619.

In the Year 821, he wrote a Letter to the Monks of *Aniane*, to exhort them to follow the Rules that had been established in their Monastery by their Abbot *Bennet*. He promises them his Protection on the account of the Love he had for him, and confirms their Abby in a Free Tenure, and the Liberty they had of choosing their Abbot.

In the Year 822, at the Request of the Bishops conven'd at *Thionville*, he made some Laws, by which he enjoy'd very severe Punishments for those, who calumniate, revile, misuse, or put to Death any Clergyman.

In the same Year he made a *Capitulary* in Favour of the Nuns of *St. Croisse* at *Poitiers*.

In the Year 824, he caused some Instructions to be composed for *Jeremias*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and *Jonas*, Bishop of *Orleans*, his Deputies at *Rome*, in the Affair of Images, according to the Prescription of the Council of *Paris*; and he wrote a Letter to Pope *Eugenius the Second* on that Subject.

In the Year 826, there was an Assembly at *Ingilheim*, where some Laws were publish'd against those that should offer any Violence to Persons consecrated to God.

In the Year 828, he appointed four Councils, *viz.* at *Mentz*, *Paris*, *Lyons*, and *Tholouse*; commanded a Solemn Fast, and sent Deputies to these Councils, to whom he gave some Instructions; and, on this Occasion, he wrote two Letters, which were address'd to the People.

In the Year 829, he caus'd the Decrees of these four Councils to be examin'd in an Assembly held at *Wormes*, and extracted some *Capitularies* out of them.

In the Year 832, he made an Edict, to confirm the Re-establishment of the Monastick Rule in the Abby of *St. Denys*, which Monastery was originally made up of *Benedictine* Monks. The Monks had taken the Habit and Way of Living of Canons, except some of them, who had retir'd within a House that belong'd to the Abby, by the Advice of *Benedict* and *Arnoldus*, who, being come to reform that Abby, had not been able to effect it; and had advis'd those who had a mind to follow *St. Bennet's* Rule, to withdraw from the rest. After this, *Hilduin* having demanded, that the Rule should be re-establish'd in that Abby, a Council held at *Paris* deputed *Aldricus*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and *Ebbon*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, to do it. Now when these were come to the Abby, they found three sorts of Religious Men there; some of them said, they never profess'd a Monastick Life, and that they desir'd still to live like *Canons*; Some others confessing, they had profess'd a Monastick Life, were sorry that they had left it, took again the Habit of Monks, and led a Life conformable to its Rules; and a third sort had always lived like Monks in a separate House. These two Archbishops settled again the Monastick Order in the Abby of *St. Denys*. But, afterwards, many of those who had resum'd the Monastick Habit and Way of Living, repented the doing it, protested against it, and presented their Petition to the Emperor against *Hilduin*, and against *Aldricus* and *Ebbon*; but, it being rejected, they resolv'd to return to their Duty, and made three Charters, by which they bound themselves to follow *St. Bennet's* Rule; one of which was presented to *Lewis the Godly*, who confirmed it by the Edict of which we are now treating.

In the Year 834, he made the City of *Hamburg* an Archbishoprick, as soon as *Anscharius* should be ordained Bishop of it; and he assign'd him all the People in the North of the *Elbe*, by his Declaration of the 12th. of *March* in the same Year.

The Sixth Council of Paris, held in the Year 829.

Of Paris.

Lewis the Godly imitating his Father *Charles the Great's* Piety and Zeal, caus'd four Councils to be conven'd in the Year 829, to reform all the Churches in *France*. These Councils met at *Mentz*, at *Lyons*, at *Tholouse*, and at *Paris*; but we have Nothing left of them all, but the *Constitutions* of that at *Paris*, which are excellent and very well written. The Bishops begin with an Exposition of the true Faith, in which they shew, that Good Works ought to be joyn'd with Faith, that it may become Saving. They add, that it must be acknowledg'd, that the Church is but one Body, which is divided into two principal Parts, the Sacerdotal and the Regal. On this Point they quote the Passage in *St. Gelasius*, and *St. Fulgentius*. Then they enlarge on the Learning and Virtues that are requisite in a Minister of the Church. They order, that unless Necessity require it, none shall be bap-

tized at any other Times but those prescribed by the Canons; and that the God-fathers shall take Care to instruct their God-children in the Faith. They renew the Inhibition made, to hinder such as are baptized out of the Solemn Times, being sick, from entering into Holy Orders. They exhort all Christians to remember the Promises they have made at their Baptism. They enlarge upon the Qualities and Virtues which those ought to have that enter into Holy Orders. They enjoyn the Bishops not to alienate the Revenues of the Church, and prescribe to them the Use they ought to make of them. They also order, that they recite the *Canonical Hours* with their Clergy, and hold Spiritual Conferences. They forbid them to prefer to any Church such Clergymen as are presented to them by Laicks, unless they find them duly qualified, and of sound Morals. They exhort them to do their Duty towards the Flock that is committed

The Capitularies, or Sanctions of Lewis the Godly.

Of Paris.

The sixth Council of Paris. mitted to their Charge, and not use it as their own, but as belonging to Christ, and to assist it corporally and spiri-
tually. They complain, that Provincial Councils were not still holden every Year; and shew, how beneficial that Practice was to the Church. They reprove the Attempts of the Suffragan Bishops. They condemn the Priests that become either Farmers, or Men of Business, and wandering Clergymen and Monks. They charge the Bishops not to send to several distant Parts such Priests as belong to some particular Church. They recommend Residence to the Priests, and a constant Attendance to instruct their Flocks. They charge the Bishops not to put their Clergy to Expence in their Visitations. They condemn several *Penitentials* to be burnt, and charge the Priests to fulfil, as they ought, the Ministry of the Keys. They order the Bishops not to give the Sacrament of Confirmation, after they have eaten, and believe that Sacraments ought to be administered fasting, unless on extraordinary Occasions. They would not have them bestow the Holy Ghost by Imposition of Hands, which is the Sacrament of Confirmation, at any other Times than at *Easter*, and on *Whitsunday*. They renew the Ancient Canons against the Crimes of Uncleanness. They will have degraded Priests put into a State of Penance. They forbid the Admission of Foreign Clergymen. They advise the Abbots to be an Example to their respective Societies. They exhort the Clergy to behave themselves modestly, decently, and honestly. They will not have such Women as have newly left a Worldly State to be *Superiors* [*i. e.* Abbesses] of Nuns. The Priests are forbidden giving the Veil to Widows without the Bishops Consent, and also consecrating Virgins; and the Abbesses are forbidden giving the Veil to Widows or Maids. They will not have the Veil to be given to Widows, till some Time after the Death of their Husbands. They do not permit Women to touch the Sacred Vessels, nor to give the Sacerdotal Habits

to the Priests, and much less to give the Eucharist, as, through a great Abuse, they did in some Places. They charge all Priests and Canons not to go into any Nunnery, nor will they have Mass said in any other Place than publick and consecrated Churches, saying, That 'tis better not to hear Mass, than to hear it where it ought not to be said. Priests are order'd not to say Mass when they are alone. They order, that, as there is a Bishop in each City [or Town] there ought to be a Priest in each Church; and they forbid one Priest officiating at several Churches. After they have spoken of keeping the Lord's-Day Holy, according to the Ecclesiastical Laws, they resolve that an Address be made to the Prince, to desire, that he may command, that no Pleadings, nor Markets be kept on that Day; and that neither Husbandmen, nor Day-labourers work on that Day in the Country. They forbid all Vexations and Usury. Finally, they will not allow those Penitents, who are not yet reconciled to the Church, to stand God-fathers to Children. This is what is handled in the first Part of this Council, so far as it relates to the Clergy, and to the Priestly Office. The second concerns Princes, and the Laity. The Bishops give some very good Instructions to Kings concerning their Duties. They recommend to them Justice, Moderation, Clemency, and other Royal Virtues. They declare to their Subjects, that they ought to obey them, and revere their Power which comes from God. They exhort the Faithful to come to Church, to joyn in the Prayers, and admonish them to behave themselves reverently there. Finally, they charge those who cannot come to Church, nevertheless to pray to God, and perform the Duties which they owe him. These Articles being fram'd, they sent them to the Emperor *Lewis*, and added twenty seven Chapters to them, which they pray'd His Majesty to enact, and cause them to be put in Execution, that the aforesaid Articles might continue and be in Force.

The Council of Aix la Chapelle, in the Year 836.

Of Aix la Chapelle. IN the Year 836, in the Month of February, there was an Assembly of Bishops at *Aix la Chapelle*, in which some *Constitutions* were made, which are divided into three Parts. The first is concerning the Virtue of Bishops: The second, touching the Learning, Manners, and Doctrine of other Clergy; And the third, of the Virtues and Duties of the Emperor, and his Children, principally in what relates to Church-Affairs. A Remonstrance was prepar'd afterwards by the said Council, address'd to King *Pepin*, and the Great Men of His Kingdom, on the Occasion of their having seiz'd, to their own Use, the Goods of the

Church; and, that the said Remonstrance might be more effectual, it was attended with three Books, that contain'd the Examples and Passages in the Old and New Testament; as also, some Ecclesiastical Laws, which make it appear, that 'tis a Crime to take away by Force, those Goods that are consecrated to God and the Church. *Eginard* tells us, that this Remonstrance wrought the desir'd Effect, and that *Pepin* yielded to these Advices which were given him by his Father and the Bishops; so that he caused the Goods which had been taken from the Churches, to be restor'd.

The Council of Thionville.

Of Thionville. IN the Year 844, *Lewis the Godly's* three Sons met at *Thionville*, and held there an Assembly of Bishops, of which *Dreux*, Bishop of *Metz*, was President. They exhorted these Princes, First, To keep a peaceable, and friendly Correspondence with each other. Secondly, to name Bishops to the Vacant Churches. Thirdly, to restore to some Monks the Places and Revenues that ought to belong to them. Fourthly, to hinder the Laity from taking into their Possession the Goods of the Church. Fifth-

ly, that if some Reasons of State obliged them to give some Abbies, or Houses of Canons, or Nuns, in *Commendam*; at least they should give Order, that the Bishop, with some Abbot, might take Care of those Monasteries and Religious Houses. Sixthly, to restore to the Whole Ecclesiastical Order, the Authority which they had, to cause the Discipline of the Church to be put in Execution, and oblige Sinners to do Penance.

The Council of Verneuil.

Of Verneuil. IN the same Year 844, a Council was held at *Verneuil*, in which, *Ebron*, Bishop of *Poitiers* was President, with *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, and the Abbot of *St. Denys*, who assisted at it, bore the Character of the King's Commissioners. The Council addresses their Constitutions to King *Charles*. First of all they exhort him to mix Severity with Mercy, and govern his People with Justice. They pray him to send his Commissioners to apprehend, and punish those disorderly Clergymen, who condemn Apostolick Dis-

cipline, and break the Holy Canons, to hinder several Monks, that they abandon not their Profession, to compel certain wandering Monks, and Clergymen to return to their Monasteries and Churches, to nominate a Bishop for the Church of *Rheims*, and confirm the Ordination of *Agins* to the Church of *Autun*; to adjourn the Debate about the Preference granted to *Dreux* the Bishop of *Metz*, to a more Numerous Council out of *France* and *Germany*; and lastly, to cause those Revenues of the Church to be restored, which Laymen have unjustly possessed themselves of.

The Council of Beauvais.

Of Beauvais. IN 845, *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, *Erchanraus*, and nine Bishops, or Archbishops of *Charles's* Kingdom, with *Hincmarus*, Archbishop Elect of *Rheims*, met in April at *Beauvais*, and compos'd eight Canons,

which they presented to that Prince, to require of him a Restitution of the Revenues and Privileges of the Church. In this Synod *Hincmarus* was ordain'd.

The Council of Meaux, in 845. and Paris, in 846.

Of Meaux. The Bishops of *France* being very earnest to perfect the Reformation of Discipline, which they had begun, met in May 845, at *Meaux*; and in February following at *Paris*, where they compos'd 80 Canons for that end. The six first were Decrees made at *Conseine*, near *Monts*, concerning the Honour of the Church,

and Peace of the State, which had the Approbation of the King, and Bishops. Those that follow, to the 13th, are the Canons made at the Synod at *Thionville*. The four next are taken out of the Council held at *Lorris* in *Anjou*, about the Authority of the King. To these are added the Decrees of the Council of *Beauvais*, concerning the Revenues of the Church.

Church. The rest were made either at *Meaux*, or *Paris*. In them the Bishops declare, that their Mansion-Houses ought to be Holy, and not frequented by Secular Men, or Women. And for this Reason it is, that they desire the King, that when he takes up his Lodgings in them, in his Journeys, that he would not bring any Women into them. They also earnestly beg of him, that he would not suffer his Retinue, or Guards, to pillage the Towns they pass through, or take what they please of the People without paying for it: They exhort him to maintain the Bishops in their Right of doing their Office, without Molestation, and executing the Holy Canons. They condemn the Custom of certain Bishops, who very seldom, or never visit their Dioceses. They revive the Ancient Laws concerning the Translation of Bishops, the Honour due to Metropolitans, holding Provincial Councils, and Residence, &c. They forbid taking Oaths about Things Sacred. They demand a Restitution of the Ancient Hospitals, and the Freedom of Monasteries. They condemn them that are Simoniacally ordain'd. They forbid the Suffragan Bishops to execute the Functions of Bishops. They command the Bishops to consecrate the Chrism upon Holy *Thursday* only, and not to take any Thing for the Distribution of it. They forbid Laymen making themselves Masters of Ecclesiastical Revenues, or choosing a Steward of them without the Consent of the Bishop, to whom the Disposal of them doth properly belong. They strictly prohibit any Priests to administer Baptism in any other Places than in the Churches where the Founts stand; and that Clergymen should be employed in any other Business besides what belongs to the Church. They ordain, that the Priests, or Clergy of another Diocese shall not be received without Letters Dimissory. They forbid, that any Strangers shall be admitted into Holy Orders, till they have continued one Year in the Communion of some Church; or Monastery, or in the City, and declare themselves against all Ordinations without a Title. They require all Prebendaries to live in one House together, and to have the same Hall, and Dormitory. They order the Bishops to have special Care of the Cardinal-Titles established in the Cities, or their Suburbs. They forbid Usury to all Christians. They order, that a Bishop shall excommunicate no Man, but for a publick and certain Crime, and then shall

not pronounce that *Anathema* against any Man, but with the Consent of his Metropolitan; and after he hath given the Admonitions commanded in the Gospel. They charge the Monks to abide in the Monasteries, and not to meddle with Secular Affairs. They petition the King not to entertain any Prebendaries in his Service, though they present themselves to him, unless the Consent of their Bishop be first had; and desire, that he may be the Person that ordains them. They forbid, that a Monk should be put out of his Monastery, till his Bishop be consulted about it, or be either himself, or Deputy present. They repeat the Laws against those that invade the Revenues of the Church, as also against Ravishers, and such Nuns as live a disorderly Life. They revive the Ancient Laws against the *Jews*. They forbid Burying the Dead in the Church, as by an Hereditary Right. They agreed, that the Bishop should sue to the King for a Commission, engaging the Judges to obey them in every Thing that respected the Ministry. They exhort the Great Men not to suffer any Disorders in their Houses, and to be particularly careful that the Priests of their Chappels should live pious Lives. They testify their earnest Desires, that the King would bestow those Chappels only upon such Priests as would exact the Tythes that belong to them, leaving the Parish-Churches to a Curate, with a Charge to uphold the Chappels, and celebrate Divine Service in them. And they add, that if the King gives them to Laymen, they ought not to receive the Tythes, but they ought to be given to the Curates, who officiate in those Chappels. They pray him to give Order, that no Pleas be held in any Court, during *Lent*, or *Easter-week*. Lastly, they desire him to confirm the Constitutions of *Charles the Great*, and *Lewis the Godly*.

These Constitutions being presented to King *Charles*, then at *Epernay*, and the Nobles opposing some of them, the King having commanded the Bishops to retire, till he consulted about them, confirmed only nineteen of them, which ought to be understood of the last of those Constitutions, which were made in the Councils of *Meaux*, and *Paris*. For the Canons of the Councils of *Comeline* and *Thionville*, were confirmed, and published by his Authority before, and are met with at the Head of his Capitularies.

The Capitularies of King Charles the Bald.

After the Constitutions before-mention'd, there follow nine made at *Troloise*, *An.* 843. upon the Complaints of certain Priests, who were over-charged by their Bishop.

In the first of them the Emperor orders, that the Bishop should do Nothing against the Priests, by way of Revenge, because they have complained against them.

In the 2^d. he commands, that the Bishops should exact no more every Year of the Priests,

† A *Muid* is a large French Measure, for Corn, containing five Seam and five Bushels of London Measure; and, for Wine, it contains 36 Gallons.

The 3^d. obliges them that dwell within one League, or a League and half of the City, to send this Present by their Servants; but in all Places at greater Distances, the Bishop shall appoint a Place in every Deanery to have them brought to. He exhorts the Bishops not to suffer those Officers, whom they shall appoint to receive those Presents, to exact them with Force, but they should kindly accept what the Priests shall bring of their own accord.

The 4th. advises the Bishops, in their Visitations, not to stay at every small Church, but to make choice of some of the principal Churches, where the Curates of the lesser shall meet them, and bring their People to be instructed and confirmed. So that they shall visit but one Church in five, and the Curates of the other four shall come to them, with their People, and bring with them every one ten Loaves, a Rundlet of Wine of 16 Gallons, a good Quantity of Oats, a fat sucking Pig, two Pullers, and some Eggs for the Maintenance of the Bishop, and his Attendants. That the Person where the Bishop lodges shall accommodate him with Nothing, but Wood, and Household Utensils; and that the Bishop shall be careful that his Servants do his Host no Damage, either in his House or Gardens.

In the 5th. he confines the Bishops, that they shall not visit above once in the Year; and, if they do it oftner, they shall be no Charge to their Curates in their other Visits.

In the 6th. he orders, that if the Bishops do not visit in Person, they shall not exact any Thing of their Curates for it, nor oblige them to be at any Expence to entertain others; and that they shall not carry along with them a great Number of Servants.

The 7th. exhorts the Bishops not to multiply Parishes without Necessity.

The 8th. declares, that the Bishops shall have no Power to decline the Observation of the Orders, under a Pretence that it belongs to them to make and explain Canons; that they ought to explain them in their genuine Sense, and not elude them by corrupt Glosses; and, if they do otherwise, he will teach them, by the Judgment of a Synod, and his own Royal Authority, how they shall explain them aright.

The 9th. says, that the Bishops shall oblige the Priests not to come to above two Synods a Year, at the set-times for them, appointed by the Canons of the Church, and that they shall judge Priests with Justice.

King *Charles* published also, at the same Place, another Constitution in Favour of the *Spaniards* and *Goths*, who were then fled into *Catalonia*.---He likewise published at *Epernay* the 19 Canons made at the Councils of *Meaux* and *Paris*, in 846.

In 853. he confirmed the Canons of the Council of *Soissons*, and made several Constitutions for the better Support of Ecclesiastical Discipline, of which I shall speak afterwards: Which were published and confirmed at the Synod held at *Verbery* the same Year; which made some other Canons also, confirmed by *Charles's* Authority.---In *December*, the same Year, he nominated several Ecclesiastical and Lay-Commissioners, in all the Provinces of *France*, and gave them several Heads of Instruction to act by in their Office; among which the second concerns the Honour of the Church.

There are also one or two about the Revenues of the Churches and Monasteries in the Constitutions made at *Arzigny*, in 854.---In his Letters-Patents of the same Year, given at *Verbery*, *Aug.* 23^d. King *Charles* confirms to the Prebendaries of the Church of *Tournay*, the Property of the Revenue she was possess'd of, and limits the Number of them to 30.

In an Assembly of Bishops and Lords, held *Anno* 856. at *Bonneuil*, they petition the King to put the Monasteries in Order, and to execute the Constitutions made at *Comeline*, *Beauvais*, *Thionville*, *Verneuil* and *Soissons*, and declare all those things Null, that shall be made in Prejudice to those Laws. They threaten him with God's Judgments, if he doth not perform their Desires.

In 857. King *Charles* made two Constitutions at *Quiercy*, which he sent to the Commissioners of his Realm, by which he gave them Power to bring all Offenders to Civil or Ecclesiastical Punishments, and particularly Ravishers.

The Capitularies of King Charles the Bald.

In 862. he put out a severe Edict at *Pisa* against Robberies, and other publick Disorders, very common at that Time, in which the Bishops join with the King, and condemn those Malefactors to Canonical Punishment, which the King condemned to Civil. In 866. there was a Constitution made at *Compeigne*, about the Liberties and Privileges of Churches, and the Authority of Bishops.

But, above all, his Edict of 869. made at *Pisa* upon the *Seine*, is the most considerable of all that he made about Ecclesiastical Discipline. In it he declares himself the Defender of the Bishops Authority, and Liberty of the Churches: He orders all his Ministers to respect their Power, execute their Commands, and preserve the Churches in the Enjoyment of their Privileges. He requires all Earls, great Lords and Judges, to give the Bishops their due Subjection; and, on the other side, that the Bishops should not encroach upon the Rights of the Earls, Lords and Judges. He commands the Bishops to do no Injustice, either to the Clergy or Laity, under their Jurisdiction; and that their Curates should give the Lords of their Parishes the Respect due to them. He enjoins the Bishops not to reject those Clergymen that are presented to them by Abbots, Abbeſſes, or Lords, to serve in their Churches, if they are not worthy of Blame for their Conversation, or Doctrine. He renews the Constitution, which forbids the Lords requiring any Thing of the Clerks they present. He forbids them excommunicating any Persons, who were not fully convicted of the Faults they were accused of; and, who after Admonition to amend and repent, have not obstinately refused to submit. He recommends Peace, Union and Friendship among his Civil Magistrates, Bishops and Clergy. He orders his Bishops to defend the Privileges granted to their Churches by the Church of *Rome*, and by the Charters of his Royal Progenitors, and that they be careful to have the Rents paid that are due to them.

The King having received Intelligence at *Pisa*, that *Lotharius* was dead, went immediately to *Lorraine* to be crown'd King of it. And being arrived there in Sept. 869. after *Adventius*, Bishop of that City, had declared in the Name of all the Bishops and People, that they all accepted him for their King, he took an Oath to preserve the Honour and Privileges of their Churches, to do Justice impartially to every Man, according to the Laws, and protect that Kingdom. After this *Hincmarus*, who performed the Ceremony of the Coronation, and ordain'd some Bishops, being admonish'd by *Adventius*, and other Bishops, which belonged to the Province of *Treves*, that this Action would prejudice the Rights of their Metropolis, made a Declaration, That it would be no Prejudice to the Rights of the Province of *Treves*, because that Province, and that of *Rheims* were like Sisters, so firmly united, that they made, but as it were one Province; since the Bishops of both met at one Synod, observed the same Canons, and among the Archbishops of *Treves* and *Rheims*, the most aged always took Place: But yet, were it not so, he ought not to be accused for meddling with the Jurisdiction of another Province, by his own Authority, or of putting his Sickle into the Harvest that did not belong to him, since he had not concerned himself with that Province, but at the Request of the Bishop, and out of Charity. Lastly, That they ought to look upon it, as a special Favour of God, that *Charles* was crown'd King at *Metz*, because heretofore his Father *Lewis the Godly*, who was descended of *Clovis* the French King, who was converted by *St. Remigius*, and baptized in the Church of *Rheims*, where he was anointed and consecrated King, by a Christ sent down from Heaven, which they still have at *Rheims*: That *Lewis the Godly* was crown'd Emperor in that City, and after he was deposed from his Imperial Throne by the Conspiracies of his Enemies, he was restored, and was crown'd again in the same City, and in *St. Stephen's* Church, whose Name was a good Omen, because it signifies a Crown. After this Declaration, he ask'd the People, if the Coronation should be celebrated before the Altar, and whether that Prince should be consecrated by the Holy Unction: The People having testified their Approbation by their Acclamations, they sang *Te Deum*, and the King was crown'd by the Priestly Benediction of the Bishops. This Constitution is very remarkable.

In the Year 874. *Charles* judged some Ecclesiastical Causes at *Attigny*, at the Request of the Bishop of *Barcelona*. The first was about a Complaint made to him, That one *Thyrſus*, a Priest of *Corduba*, had called the People together at a

Church of *Barcelona*, and had taken away from him almost two Thirds of his People; That he celebrated Mass, and administred Baptism without his Permission. That he caused those People to go to his Church on the Feasts of *Nativity* and *Easter*, which ought to be at his Cathedral, and gave them the Sacrament. The King recited the Canons, which condemned the Practice of that Priest. The second Complaint, made by the Bishop of *Barcelona*, was, That another Priest had engaged the Inhabitants of the Castle of *Terracine*, not to submit to his Jurisdiction. The King order'd, that the Canons in that Case should be observed. The third was against two private Persons, who having intercepted the King's Letters, had possessed themselves, the one of *St. Stephen's* Church, and the other of certain Lands belonging to the Church of *St. Eulalia*. The King commanded, that if this could be prov'd, his Commissioners should give an Account what Letters had been intercepted, that being reported to the Council, it might be examined by them.

Lewis, the Emperor of *Italy*, being dead, Aug. 8. 875. *Charles* was crown'd Emperor at *Rome* on Christmas-day of the same Year, by Pope *John VIII.* and at his Return, received the Crown of *Lombardy* at *Pavia*, and the Confirmation of his Imperial Crown in an Assembly of the Nobles and Bishops of that Country, held Feb. 876. at which the Pope was present in Person. After this, to acknowledge the Obligations he had to the Pope, he made a Constitution, in which he decreed, That all Persons should pay a special Veneration to the Holy Roman Church, the Head of all other Churches; that no Man should dare to attempt any Thing in Violation of her Power and Privileges; but she should enjoy her full Authority, and exercise her Pastoral Care over all the Church; that they should particularly honour the Supreme Bishop, and Universal Pope *John*; that his Decrees should be received, with all due Regard, and Obedience be given him in all Things he hath Right to: He forbids all Persons encroaching upon the Lands and Revenues of the Church of *Rome*. He then commands, that due Respect be paid to the Sacerdotal Authority and Clergy; that all should submit to the Imperial Authority, and none should be so bold as to resist his Orders. That Bishops should freely exercise their Function, and punish Offenders; that they be careful to preach. He enjoins the Laymen which dwell in the Cities, to be present at the Assemblies of the Church on Festival-days, and forbids them having Private Chappels in their Houses. He requires, that Bishops should have Colleges for their Prebendaries near the Church; that Prebendaries should live according to the Canonical Rules, and be subject to their Bishop. He forbids Clergymen dwelling, or conversing with Women, as also Hunting. He provides for the Preservation of the Church-Revenues, and Payment of Tythes. He commends Friendship between the Nobility and Clergy. This was published and received at *Pontigon* in July 876.

Lastly, *Charles the Bald* held an Assembly of his Nobles at *Quiercy*, June 877. in which he made several Constitutions by his own Authority, and propounded others to his Nobles for their Advice. The Constitutions now made about Discipline, are these: The 1st. was about the Honour and Liberty of Churches, so often repeated. By the 2^d. he confirms the Privileges of the Abby of *St. Mary of Compeigne*, granted by the Pope; received by the Bishops, and authorized by the King's Letters. The 8th. secures the Revenues of vacant Archbishopricks, and Bishopricks. In the 12th. he nominates several Bishops, Abbots and Earls to dispose of his Alms, which he should give by Will, after his Death. The rest contain several Directions for doing what is necessary for the Good of his Kingdom and Children after his Decease: Two days after he renewed again the Constitution about the Honour of Churches, and Authority of Bishops; he confirmed several Ecclesiastical and Civil Laws, and promised to put them in Execution. He provides for the Preservation of the Estate of an Earl lately deceased, till his Son was in Possession of it; and for the Security of those Churches who have lost their Bishop, Abbot, or Superior, till they have a Successor. These are the last Constitutions of *Charles the Bald*, who died August the 28th. following at *Frankfort*, in the 70th. Year of his Age, and 59th. from his first Coronation. He was a Lover of Justice, Religion, and of the Church, and was the nearest of any Prince of his Race, to *Charles the Great*, in his good Qualities and Virtues.

The Capitularies of King Charles the Bald.

The Council of Mentz, held Anno 847.

Of Mentz.

His Council was held under *Rabanus*, An. 847. It was made up of 12 Bishops, some Suffragans, several Abbots, Monks, Priests, and others of the Clergy. The Bishops and Clergy made one Body, and had the Gospels, Canons, and Fathers laid before them; The Monks the Rule of *St. Benedict*, that they might unanimously endeavour a Reformation of the Clergy, and the Monastick Life. —First, They particularly recommended

to the Bishops, that they should take Care that the People be well instructed in the Fundamentals of Religion; and, for that End, certain Homilies should be composed in the Vulgar Tongue. Secondly, That Baptism should be administred according to the Rites of the Church of *Rome*, and at the Times appointed by the Pope's Decretals.

They exhort all Men to Peace; and order, That not only those Men should be excommunicated, who attempt any Thing

Of Mentz.

The Council of Mentz.

Thing against the King or State; but those, who, by Surprise, contrary to his good Affection to Religion, obtain of him the Lands and Revenues that belong to the Church.

They leave the whole Disposal of the Church's Revenues in the Power of the Bishops, and forbid the Clergy to make Use of them, to augment their own Estates, or dispose of them. They secure their Tythes, and other Rights, to the Churches. They revive the Canons concerning such Employments as are forbid Clergymen and Monks.

They forbid Monks to have any Possessions of their own, to covet the Enjoyment of Worldly Things, which they have renounced, and to take on them any Cure of Souls, without the Consent of the Bishop.

They forbid Abbesses to go out of their Monasteries without great Necessity, and without the Leave of the Bishop.

They revive the ancient Canons of the Council of *Ancyra* against Manslayers. They declare, touching the Administration of the Sacraments to the Sick, that the Priests ought to require of them a sincere Confession, without imposing on them any rigorous Penance, but only to bring their Sins to Remembrance, and comfort them under them, by the

Prayers of their Friends, and by their Aims, and so absolve them, upon Condition nevertheless, that if they recover their Health, they shall undergo what Penance shall be imposed on them; after which they may administer the Unction, and then the Communion, as their *Viaticum*.

They are not afraid to grant such Malefactors, as suffer for their Crimes, if they confess their Sins, and are penitent, the Honour of a Christian Burial; and that their Offerings be received, and Masses said for them.

Lastly, After they have forbidden all Contracts of Marriages, either Incestuous, or within the Degrees of Consanguinity, prohibited by the Laws; they command, that Penances, proportionable to Mens Crimes, shall be imposed upon them; that Publick Sinners shall do Publick Penance; and they, whose Sins are Secret, shall undergo Private Penance.

This is almost all that is contained in the one and thirty Canons of this Council. We shall not here speak of the Council of *Mentz* held the next Year, against *Gottschalkus*, nor of those that concern his Affair, nor *Ebbo's*, because we have spoken of them at large in another Place.

The Council of Pavia.

Of Pavia.

THE Emperor *Lotharius*, and his Son *Lewis*, held an Assembly at *Pavia*, Anno 850. in which the Bishops made 25 Articles, or Constitutions.

In the 1st. they order, that the Bishops should have some Priests, or other Clergymen Witnesses of their most secret Actions.

In the 2^d. that they should not neglect not only to celebrate Mass publicly on Sundays and Festivals, but, if it be possible, offer that Sacrifice every day in private.

In the 3^d. they order, that their Meals should be temperate, and that they should entertain Pilgrims and Strangers at them; whom they should entertain with pious Discourses and Exhortations.

In the 4th. they forbid the Pleasures and Luxury of the World.

In the 5th. they advise them to study the Holy Scripture; to explain it to their Clergy, and to preach upon it to the People.

The 6th. imports, that the Bishops should be careful that the Priests discharge their Duties well in the Government which is entrusted to them: That the Archpriests should go to the Heads of Families, to exhort Publick Offenders to do Publick Penance: That in difficult Cases they should apply themselves to the Bishops, and the Bishops should consult their Brethren.

The 7th. orders, that the Priests should examine whether the Penitents perform the Works of Penance; That the Absolution of Publick Penitents is reserved to the Bishops, and that no Priest shall absolve them but in the Absence of the Bishop, and with his Allowance, because the Imposition of Hands was reserved to the Apostles.

The 8th. engages them to instruct the People in the saving Nature of the Sacrament of Unction, of which the Apostle *St. James* speaks [*Chap. 5. 14.*] and make them sensible, that they can hope to receive the wished-for Effects of that Mystery, viz. Remission of Sins, and Health, only when they desire it with a sound and full Faith. That because it often happens, that sick Persons know not the Force of that Sacrament, or think their Distempers inconsiderable; or forget to desire it, because their Minds are taken up with the Pains of their Sickness; the Priest of the Place ought to put them in mind of receiving it, and invite the Priests of his Neighbourhood to be present at the Administration. But if the sick Person be in a State of Penance, he ought not to bestow it on him, till he be reconciled to the Church; because he that is not allowed to receive the other Sacraments, is not in a Capacity of receiving this.

The 9th. advises Fathers of Families to marry their Daughters as soon as they are of Age, and condemns them to Penance, if they happen to be debauch'd, either by their Negligence, or Connivance; and forbids, that the Benediction be given them, who marry after they are deflowered. It also says, that Marriage is forbidden those, who are in a Course of Publick Penance.

The 10th. is against Ravishers, and declares, that they cannot lawfully marry the Persons they have forced; and allows such Persons no Absolution, but just at the Point of Death.

The 11th. orders, that they who commit a Publick Crime in any Place, shall be excluded from Communion by the Bishop of that Place, and put to Penance, and not be received to Communion by any other.

The 12th. declares, that they who are deprived of Com-

munion, and put to Penance for their Crimes, may not exercise any publick Offices, but can't be prohibited from taking Care of their Domestick Affairs. That such Persons as refuse to do Penance, ought to be excommunicated and anathematized, after all proper Means are used to make them submit to their Duty. Yet this is not to be done without the Judgment of the Metropolitan, and Bishops of the Province.

The 13th. orders the Bishops to commit the Care of Priests of smaller Parishes to the Archpriests.

The 14th. commands those Bishops who have suffered the Monasteries of their Dioceses to be demolished, to have them immediately repaired and re-built.

The 15th. imports, that such Hospitals, as are subject to Bishops, shall be govern'd according to the Orders of their Founders: That those that are under the Protection of the Church, shall be govern'd by the Heirs of the Founders, according to the Rules of their Institution, who shall hinder all Embezzelling the Revenues, and Mis-employment of them.

The 16th. resolves, that they will represent to the Prince; the Misdemeanour of those Hospitals, that are under their Protection.

The 17th. orders, that all Christians should pay their Tythes, which shall be employed for the Maintenance of the Clergy, and the Necessities of the Church, according to the Disposal of the Bishop.

The 18th. importeth, that they will not suffer any of those Priests, or Clergymen, who are called *Acephali*, not under the Discipline of any Bishop; and that those Priests, that celebrate Divine Service in Noblemens Chappels, shall be such as are approved by the Bishop; or if they be out of other Bishopricks, shall have Commendatory Letters from their own Bishop: That they will not suffer wandring Clerks, nor any other Persons without a Mission.

The 19th. forbids putting Clergymen upon Secular Employments.

The 20th. imports, that they shall be excommunicated, who suffer *Jews* to be either the Judges, or Receivers of Tribute.

The 21st. forbids Usury, and obliges such, as have made Advantage by it, to Restitution.

The 22^d. imports, that they who neglect the Care of Orphans and Widows committed to their Charge, shall be admonished of it, and exhorted to be very diligent and watchful for them; but if they will not do it, they shall petition the King to appoint them other Guardians.

The 23^d. is against those Clergymen and Monks, who, going up and down the Cities, stir up unprofitable Questions, and disperse Errors. They order, that such Men shall be apprehended by the Bishop of the Place, and carried to the Metropolitan; and if it be found that they have vented such Doctrines through Ambition, and not for the Instruction, or Edification of the Faithful, they shall be punished, as the Disturbers of the Church's Peace.

The 24th. forbids the ill Practices of certain Peasants, who married their Sons very young to full grown Women, to be abused by them, and prohibits such Marriages.

The last condemns certain Magicians to very severe Penance, and deprives them of Absolution till the Point of Death, who boasted, they could make Persons love, or hate one another by their Art; and, whom they suspected of having killed some Men by it.

The

The Council of Soissons, Anno 853.

THE Council hath three Parts. 1. Some Canons. 2. The Acts of eight Sessions, about the Affair of *Ebbo*, and the Clerks ordained by him. 3. Some Constitutions published by the Emperor. What is contained in the Acts of this Council, we have related in the History of *Hincmarus*. So that there remain only the Canons and Imperial Constitutions.

The 1st is Nothing else but an Abridgment of the Judgment given against *Ebbo*.

The 2^d is concerning *Heriman*, Bishop of *Nevers*; who, being a Man of a weak Judgment, had committed several Misdemeanours in his Office; and, notwithstanding that, desired to continue in his Function. They order *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, his Metropolitan, to go to *Nevers*, to put that Church in Order, and bring away *Heriman* to *Sens* along with him, till the Summer, in which he was worst in his Mind, was over, and send him again when he was grown something better.

In the 3^d they reform what had passed in the Business of the Bishop of *Chartres*. They question'd the Validity of his Election, and maintain, that he is not fit to be a Bishop. It was order'd, that he should either justify himself, or retire; and they charged *Hincmarus*, *Pardulus*, and *Agins*, to certify him of their Resolution. He thinking himself innocent, and being confirmed in that Opinion by the Testimony of the Clergy and Laity of *Chartres* who were present, he thought it his best Time to appear, which he accordingly did, and said, That it would be a great Piece of Pride in him to assert himself worthy of so great a Dignity, but if any Person accused him of any Crime, he was ready to defend himself. No Man appearing, the Council order'd, that certain Commissioners chosen by *Wenilo*, should be sent to *Chartres*, to examine the Ordination of *Burchard*, give in their Report, and ordain him Bishop.

In the 4th they relate, that the Bishop of *Mans* being troubled with the Palsie, wrote to the Council to be excused for not coming to it, and to desire the Bishops to pray for him, both so long as he lived, and after his Death. That the Bishops promised to do their Duty, and gave Order to *Amaricus*, Archbishop of *Tours*, his Metropolitan, to go to the City of *Mans*, and to do what he saw convenient for the Advantage of that Church in this Juncture.

In the 5th they declare, that they had deposed and banished into remote Monasteries, those Monks and Priests of the Abby of *St. Medard*, who had conspired to secure *Pepin*, *Charles's* Nephew, who was shaved and shut up in that Abby.

The 6th is against a Deacon of the Church of *Rheims*, who was accused of putting out Edicts in the Emperor's

Name, they debarr him going to any Synod, and confine him within the Diocels of *Rheims*, till he should clear himself.

The other Canons are some Propositions, which they intended to make to the King; That he would send Commissioners to set up Divine Service in the Monasteries. That he would permit the Churches to enjoy their ancient Privileges. That he would pay to the Church the ninth and tenth Part of those Revenues, which belonged to it of old. That he would not hold any Courts in any Place consecrated to the Service of God. That none should protect those, whom the Bishop would punish by the Laws of the Church. That on the contrary, incestuous Persons, and others guilty of like Crimes, should be referr'd to the Bishops by the Civil Judges. Lastly, That there should be no Exchanges made of the Churches Lands or Revenues, without the Consent of the King. In Answer to these Demands, the Emperor made twelve Constitutions, in which he granted them more than they had desired of him. For in the first, he orders that his Commissioners shall make Enquiry, with the Bishop of the Place, and in the Presence of him who hath Charge of the Monastery, concerning the Life and Behaviour of those that dwell in it; that he will regulate the Discipline, and cause them to make the Repairs carefully. That the Churches shall be adorned, and furnished with Tapers and Books, &c. That he will compose a verbal Process, in which he will put the Name of the Abbot, or Superior of each Monastery, the Time of his Enjoyment of it; the Number of the Canons and Monks, or Religious Persons, to increase or diminish it, &c. That they should enquire, whether the Heirs of such as founded the Monastery, did not detain the Revenues their Ancestors had given them. That they should inform themselves of the Revenues of Chappels, and several Monasteries farmed out; —and if they had a Care to keep up the Buildings, and provide all Things necessary for Divine Service. That they should inform themselves of such Estates of the Church, as are given in Fee-simple; and of those Persons which pay Nincths and Tenths: That they shall forbid, that any Pleading be had in Church Porches, Quires, or any other Places, or in Lent. That they shall declare, that those that study to revenge them whom the Bishops have chastised for their Faults, shall be excommunicated, and pay a large Fine. That they shall order the Judges to assist the Bishop in his Visits, and constrain the Excommunicated to do their Penance. That they shall declare, that he will give no Letters to set to Farm the Church-Revenues. Lastly, That they shall forbid making any Exchange of the Church Lands, or Slaves, without the Consent of the King.

The Council of Verbery, Anno 853.

THE same Bishops that were convened in the Council of *Soissons* in Feb. met at *Verbery* in August the same Year, where they wrote a Letter, in which they declare, that they would settle *Heriman* in his Bishoprick of *Nevers*, and that he was not deprived of it for any Fault he had committed, but only for the Infirmary

of which he was cured. They prevented the giving by a precarious Title, an Abby and Farm which belonged to the Abby of *St. Denys*. *Lotharius*, in this Assembly, caused the Verbery. Constitutions which had been made at *Soissons*, to be read over and received.

The Council of Rome, under Leo the IV.

IN 853. Pope *Leo IV.* called a Council at *Rome* in December, in which he confirmed the Canons of a Synod held under *Sergius II.* in 826. and made some Additions to them. He also composed some new Canons, and deposed *Anastasius* a Priest of the Church of *St. Marcellus*, who having left his Church, fled out of the Country, and would not return after several Admonitions given him, nor justify himself before the Council. There are thirty eight Canons made by the Synod held by *Sergius*. The six first concern the Lives, Knowledge, and Manners of the Bishops. The eight following contain some Constitutions about the Life of Priests. The fifteenth forbids all Familiarity of Clergymen and Bishops with Women, and chiefly any Woman with whom they are suspected to deal carnally. The sixteenth forbids alienating the Church-Revenues. The seventeenth prohibits, that the Offerings of Sinners be accepted. The eighteenth orders, that no Letters Dimissory be given to any Clergymen, but such only as are desired by some other Bishop. The nineteenth and twenty first are about the Advocates, who ought to have Bishops to patronize their Causes. The twentieth enjoyns the Founder of a Monastery or Chappel, to name a Priest approved by the Bishop to it. The two following Canons concern the Administrations and Usage of the Church's Revenues. The twenty fourth orders, that Divine Service be settled again in the Churches, where it had been discontinued. The twenty fifth com-

mands that sacred Places be built again. The twenty sixth forbids the Bishops exacting any Thing against Law. The twenty seventh imports, that they should choose Abbots fit to govern the Monasteries. The twenty eighth enjoyns Bishops to take Care, that those that profess themselves Monks, should live regularly. The twenty ninth commands, that young Women who have taken on them a Religious Life, should not marry. The thirtieth and thirty first concern the Sanctification of the Sunday. The thirty second commands, that such as are shut up in the Monasteries for their Crimes, should not be suffered to go out. The thirty third says, that 'tis not allowable for Laymen, to place themselves with the Priests or Clergy, at Divine Service. The thirty fourth says, that there shall be in all Cathedral Churches and other Places where 'tis necessary, Masters and Tutors to teach the Liberal Sciences. The thirty fifth forbids Balls, Dancing, and other Sports upon the Feasts of the Martyrs. The thirty sixth prohibits Men putting away their Wives and marrying others, unless in Case of Adultery, and orders, that if a Man and his Wife are willing to part, to embrace a Religious Life, they must do it with the Consent of the Bishop, who shall examine both the Man and his Wife, whether they do both indeed consent to it. The thirty seventh forbids Polygamy. The thirty eighth is against Marriage within the Degrees of Consanguinity forbidden.

The Council of Rome. **L**eo IV. made some Additions to these Canons, which were Nothing else but Explications of them, or some Clauses to confirm them. But he added four new Canons. The first imports, that no greater Number of Priests or Clergymen be ordained in every Church, than is just necessary. The second, that Priests should present themselves at the Council of their Bishops. The third orders, that Laymen

who retain Priests that are Strangers, and employ them against the Consent of their Bishop, shall be themselves excommunicated, and the Priests deposed; if upon Admonition, they will not return to their Diocess. The fourth says, Rome, that no Man shall settle Priests in the Churches, but he that hath Right to ordain in those Churches, and punish those that are in it, *i. e.* none but the Bishop of the Diocess.

The third Council of Valence.

Of Valence **I**N January 855. the Emperor *Lotharius* called a Synod at *Valence*, of fourteen Bishops belonging to the Provinces of *Lyons*, *Vienna*, and *Arles*, over whom their Metropolitans presided, and *Ebbo* Bishop of *Grenoble*, to judge the Bishop of *Valence*, who was accused of several Crimes. In this Council, the Decisions about Grace above mentioned, were made, which make up the first six Canons of this Council. The seventh is about the Election of Bishops. They declare in it, that to prevent, that ignorant and unfit Persons be not preferr'd to Bishopricks, they would petition the King, that the Bishop of every Diocess shall be chosen by the Clergy and People who shall be obliged to choose a Person out of the same, or a neighbouring Church, fit to fill the See, and that if the Emperor shall send any of his Officers to be Bishop, they shall examine his Life and Doctrine carefully, that the Metropolitan shall have a Care, that the Bishop who is ordained, be a Person fit for that Charge. The eighth is against those who invade the Revenues of the Church. The ninth is against those that take the Revenues of Chappels. The tenth orders, that they pay the Ninth and Tenth of the Revenues of alienated Churches, and condemn Usury. The eleventh forbids taking the Oaths of both Parties in Justice, and excommuni-

cates him that doth the contrary. The twelfth forbids the Combates, which were in Use to prove Mens Innocence. The thirteenth imports, that such as are disobedient to their Bishops, shall do Penance, and such as are excommunicated in one Church, shall not be received in another. The fourteenth forbids all vexatious Troubles, and commends Union and Love in Clergymen. The fifteenth enjoins the Bishops to live an Exemplary Life. The sixteenth orders them to preach to, and instruct their People. The seventeenth commands them to visit their Diocess, without being a Charge to any Man. The eighteenth requires, that Schools be set up for Learning and Singing. The nineteenth imports, that the Metropolitans and Bishops should take Care that the Clergy live orderly. The twentieth enjoins, that the Ornaments of Churches be preserved, and used only according to the Canons. The twenty first says, that Church-Revenues shall not be alienated. The twenty second says, that a Bishop shall not receive the Rights of the Visitation, when he doth not visit. The twenty third is in Favour of the Archdeacon of the Church of *Vienna*, whom they had redeemed from Slavery. They assert he was not a Slave, and threaten Excommunication to them, who shall persecute him upon that Account.

The Council of Quiercy.

Of Quiercy **I**N November, 858. the Bishops of the Province of *Rheims* and *Rouen* being assembled at *Quiercy*, composed a Letter directed to *Lewis* King of *Germany*, who had possessed himself of the Kingdom of *Charles*, surrendered to him at *Arrigny*, by *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and *Ercmarus* Bishop of *Chalons*. After they had excused themselves for not being present, according to the Orders they had received at the Assembly held at *Rheims*, because they had not sufficient Warning to provide for their Journey, and get Leave of their Metropolitans, they passionately represent to that Prince the Disorders of the People of his Realm, and the lamentable State the Church was in. They exhort him to maintain the Rights and Privileges of the Churches, the Authority of the Bishops, and Honour of the Priests; to put in Execution the Canons and Constitutions, which concerned the Liberty of the Church; to restore their Revenues to the Church and Clergy; to put the Monasteries and Abbies of the Monks and Nuns into their ancient Con-

dition; and to take them from the Laymen, to whom his Brother was forced to grant them. They give him many Instructions about his own Carriage, and how he ought to govern his Kingdom. They let him know, that they thought he had no Right to mind the King his Brother's Countries; and, at last, protest, that they could not take the Oath he desired of them; nor subject their Churches to him, or their Revenues, as if they were Temporal Estates. This Letter is written with much Elegance and Freedom. In it they threaten that Prince with the Judgments of God, and terrifie him with representing to him his sad Condition at the Hour of Death. They give him several Instructions and Precepts about Civil Matters, and speak to him in a Majestick Style. They relate to him a fabulous Story of the Damnation of *Charles Martel*, for having taken away Church-goods. There is some Probability that *Hincmarus* composed this Letter; for which Reason 'tis printed among his Works.

The Council of Metz.

Of Metz. **L**EWIS of *Germany* being obliged to retire in 859. the Council assembled at *Metz* sent nine Prelates to him, to exhort that Prince to beg Peace of his Brother, to acknowledge and confess his Fault, oblige him to promise to live peaceably for the Future, and never hereafter to cause Schism, or Division, to punish them who were the Authors of this War, to engage himself to maintain the Rights of the Churches, and procure a Reformation: That if he did these Things, although his Faults deserved a long Penance, they could absolve him, although they did not joyn with him. These Messengers, who had for their Leaders, *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, and *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Rouen*, finding *Lewis* of *Germany* at *Worms*, June the 4th. the Prince spake to them first, and being desirous to appease them, said to them, That if he had offended them, he begged their Pardon. *Hincmarus*, who

stood the first on his Left-hand, answered, That he came to offer him what he desired; that, as to his own Particular, he had Nothing against him; that he pardon'd him what he had done; and as for the Mischief he had done his Church, he advised him, as he tender'd his own Salvation, to make it up. *Guntbarius*, Archbishop of *Cologne*, who was also one of the Messengers, told him what Satisfaction they demanded of him, and read the Instructions to him they had given them. *Lewis* of *Germany* was displeased with them, and told them for Answer, That they came provided with full Instructions, that they might surprise him: That the Bishops of his Kingdom not being present, he could do Nothing in that Affair without consulting them. So that this Embassage had not that good Effect which they hoped for by it.

The Council of Savonieres.

Of Savonieres. **I**N June, the same Year 859. the Bishops of both Kingdoms met at *Savonieres*, near *Toul*, where they made up a Peace and Agreement between the Kings. In it also they regulated several other Affairs. *Tortoldus* Deacon of *Sens*, who had taken upon him to exercise the Episcopal Functions at *Bayeux*, was left to the Judgment of *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and three other Bishops. They ordained, that the Subdeacon *Anscharius*, who had possessed himself of the Church of *Langres*, should make Oath, that he would not attempt the like for the Future. King *Charles* accused *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, as the Cause of his Rebellion; and it was order'd, that his Process should be made according to the Canons. *Atto*, Bishop of *Verdun*, was

summoned, because his Ordination was accused as faulty. They also charged the Bishops of *Bretany* not to withdraw themselves from the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of *Tours*, their Metropolitan. They admonished them not to communicate with Persons under Excommunication; and to exhort their Prince *Solomon*, to be faithful to King *Charles*. They also allow the Persons excommunicated till the next Council, to amend and reform themselves; and, if they did not do it, they would pronounce a solemn Anathema upon them at the next General Council. This Synod earnestly intreats the King, and *Ralph*, Archbishop of *Bourges*, to maintain the Privileges of the Abby of *St. Benedict*, which that Archbishop had possessed himself of, upon Condition, that

The Council of Savonieres. that if the Abbot were found negligent, or irregular, by the King's Commissioners, he should be deposed, and another put in his Place. They set in Order several other private Affairs, of which there is no Mention in the Canons, and ordered Prayers. This Synod was very numerous: At it were eight Metropolitans, and most of the Bishops of the twelve Provinces of *France*. We have, besides the thirteen Canons, or Articles, already mention'd, three Letters, one to *Wenilo*, Archbishop of *Sens*, and two others to the *Bretons*, with a Remonstrance, containing an Accusation of that Archbishop, brought against him by *Charles the Bald*.

They read also in this Council the six Constitutions of *Valence* about Grace; and ten other Canons made fifteen days before, by some Bishops met at *Langres*. We will not repeat what we have said about the Constitutions of the Council of *Valence*, and how *Hincmarus* opposed the Reception of them; but we will give the Substance of the other ten Canons.

The 1st. imports, that they would petition their Kings to call Synods every Year in every Province, and every Second Year a General Council in their Palaces.

The 2^d. ordains, that the Bishops should be ordained ac-

cording to the Canonical Laws; that is to say, by the Judgment of the Metropolitan, and neighbouring Bishops; and such Persons should be chosen, as are of good Life, and known Probity.

The 3^d. commands, that Bishops visit Religious Houses, and take Care, that all Things be managed and disposed in good Order.

The 4th. enjoins them to set up Schools, or teach the Holy Scripture, and good Learning.

The 5th. requires them to repair their Churches.

The 6th. orders, that every Congregation should have an Head of their Profession.

The 7th. declares, that the alienated Revenues of the Church shall pay their Ninth and Tenth Parts, and that for the Future, Nothing shall be taken from the Church.

The 8th. enjoins, that the Revenues of Hospitals shall be employed according to the Intent of the Founders.

The 9th. declares, that they will cause Justice to be done to the Poor by the Civil Judges.

The 10th. contains their Resolve to punish Ravishers and Adulterers.

The Council of Coblentz.

Of Coblentz. THE Peace which was made between the Kings at the Council of *Savonieres* in 859. was confirmed and sworn to, *Anno* 860. at an Assembly held at *Coblentz*; at which, ten Bishops, and several Lords were present. In it was agreed, that Publick Sinners should be put to Penance; and, that no Bishop should excommuni-

cate any Man, till after Admonition and Reproof; That they would pardon those Rebels that accepted a Pardon, and promised Fidelity for the Future; That they would put the Laws and Canons against Criminals in Execution. Some other Ecclesiastical Laws and Civil Constitutions were made in it.

The second Council of Tullium, or Toul.

Of Tullium, or Toul. IN October 860. a General Council was held at *Touffy*, in the Province of *Toul*. There were present almost sixty Bishops out of twelve or fourteen Provinces of *France*. They compos'd a Pastoral Letter against those that invaded the Churches Revenues; and, because it seem'd too tedious to some of them, they made five Canons, which were signed by all the Bishops.

In the 1st. they excommunicate, and deprive of Burial all those, that take, or receive the Oblations of the Church without the Consent of the Bishop, or the Person, who is entrusted with the Care of the Church-Revenues; and condemn those of the Clergy or Laity who shall do it, to restore three or four-fold.

In the 2^d. it is ordained, that Widows, or Virgins, devoted to the Service of God, who marry, or suffer themselves to be deflowered, shall be imprisoned, and put to Penance till their Death: And they that so debauch them, shall also be forced to undergo Penance.

The 3^d. pronounces Excommunication against all perjured Persons, and false Witnesses.

The 4th. excludes from the Communion of the Faithful, and from Divine Service, all Ravishers and Man-slayers, till they shall submit to a Course of Penance.

The 5th. enjoins all wandring Clergymen, and Monks, which are out of Employ, because their Churches, or Monasteries, are burnt by the *Normans*, to betake themselves to their Duties, and submit themselves to their Abbots, or Bishops.

We have spoken about the Contest between the two *Hincmarus's*, concerning these Canons; the Archbishop of *Rheims* maintaining, that they were not made by a Council, and that he did not sign them: The Bishop of *Laon* affirming the contrary. It is probable, that *Hincmarus*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, compos'd the large Letter; but, that not being liked, some others digested the five Canons, which were signed by several of them. This Council order'd *Hincmarus* to write to the Archbishops of *Bourges*, and *Bourdeaux*, and Bishops of their Provinces, about the Affair of Earl *Raimond*, which we have explained in the History of *Hincmarus's* Works. And because we have also spoken of the Councils of *Aix la Chapelle*, *Metz* and *Rome*, held about the Divorce of *Lotharius* and *Thietberga*, we shall pass them over here; as also those held about the Business of *Rothadus*, *Hincmarus* of *Laon*, *Ebbo*, *Wulfadus*, of which we have spoken in the History of the Controversies, in which *Hincmarus* was chiefly concerned.

The Council of Worms.

Of Worms. IN 868. in June, *Lewis* King of *Germany*, assembled a General Council of his Kingdom at *Worms*: In it, the Bishops first of all compos'd a Confession of their Faith; in which they asserted the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father, and the Son; and rejected the Opinion of those, who affirmed, that it proceeded from the Father by the Son, or from the Son only. They deliver, that the Resurrection shall be in the same Flesh, in which we live, and that the Catholick Church shall reign with *Jesus Christ* for ever.

After they had made this Confession of Faith, they compos'd, or rather revived several Canons. The 1st. imports, that Baptism shall be solemnly administred only at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*. The 2^d. that it belongs to the Bishop only to consecrate the Chrism. The 3^d. that a Bishop shall not require any Present for the Consecration of Churches; and that they shall use Nothing but Bread and Wine, mingled with Water, in the Sacrament of the Altar. The 5th. contains a Rule of *St. Gregory*, about Dipping once, or thrice in Baptism. The 6th. that the Disposal of the Church-Revenues belongs to the Bishops, and not to the Founders. The 7th. that they shall divide the Church-Revenues into four Parts. The 8th. is an Extract of the seventh Canon of the 2^d. Council of *Seville*. The 9th. contains a Law of Celibacy, for all in sacred Orders. The 10th. concerns a Bishop accused of a Crime. The 11th. declares, that Priests, who have been guilty of Carnal Sins, ought not to enjoy their Dignity. The 12th. that they that are accused of that Crime, but can't be convicted, shall clear themselves by their Oath. The 13th. that Bishops shall not excommunicate any Man for small Faults. The 14th. that if they do,

their neighbouring Bishops shall not communicate with them, till a Synod shall meet. The 15th. orders, that if there be any Robbery done in any Monastery, and the Author is not known, all the Brethren shall communicate at one Mass, that by that Means it may be known that they are innocent. The 16th. excommunicates the Bishops that refuse to come to a Synod, or withdraw before 'tis ended. The 17th. forbids Clergymen keeping Hunting-dogs, or Hawks. The 18th. orders, that strange Clergymen shall not be suffer'd to exercise their Ecclesiastical Functions, unless they have a Letter from their Bishop. The 19th. says, that those that will not obey their Bishops, nor execute their Ministry diligently, in the Church which shall be allotted them, shall be excommunicated and degraded. The 20th. appoints, that those Women, who are devoted to God by the sacred Veil, and fall into any Carnal Crimes, shall not leave their Profession, but shall be put to severe Penance. The 21st. obliges those Widows, who have taken the Veil, and have prayed in the Church among the profess'd Nuns, offer'd Oblations with them, and promis'd to continue in that Estate, never to leave it. The 22^d. holds, that it is not lawful for them, who have by their Parents been put into the Monasteries in their Infancy, and have been brought up in a Regular Discipline, to leave or forsake that sort of Life, when they are come to a riper Age. The 23^d. revives that Maxim of the Councils of *Spain*, that a Man may be made a Monk, either by the Devotion of his Parents, or by his own proper Profession; and declares, that both Ways equally oblige: And those, that are made so either Way, may not return to a Secular Life. The 24th. is against them that do any Injury to Clergymen or Churches. The 25th.

commands Priests to impose Penances proportionable to Mens Crimes, and agreeable to the Laws of the Church. The following Canons contain the Punishments of different sorts of Manslaughter. The 31st. gives Lepers a Liberty of receiving the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, but not with those that are in perfect Health. The 32^d. says, that the Number of Children, which a Man may have, can't be determin'd; yet no Man may marry his near Relations. The 33^d. forbids marrying two Sisters. The 34th. a God-mother, or God-daughter. The 35th. condemns to the Penance of Murtherers; those Women, who cause Abortions in themselves; and those to something less Punishments, who smother their Children in their Sleep, though not thinking of it. The 36th. subjects to Penance, and separates him from his Wife, who hath layn with his Wife's Daughter by another Husband. The 37th. imports that married Persons, though under Penance, are not to be parted. The 38th. and 39th. impose Penance upon those that kill their Slaves. The 40th. appoints, that a Bishop, who ordains a Slave, knowing him to be such, without the Consent of his Master, shall pay double the Worth of him to his Master; but, if he were ignorant of it, the Sum shall

be paid by them, who were Witnesses for him. The 41st. orders, that they shall be excommunicated who live in Enmity, and will not be reconciled. The 42^d. constitutes, that no Man shall be condemned, who is not formally convicted. The 43^d. sentences them to Deprivation of their Goods, and Excommunication till Death, who side with the Enemies of the State. The 44th. condemns Adulterers to a seven Years Penance.

These are the 44 Canons, which are all, but the 40th. in an Ancient MS. under the Name of the Council of Worms. There are also 36 other Canons, that bear the Name of this Council. But since they are not to be found in any Ancient MS. and some of them are already among the 44 preceding; and Labbe hath assured us, that the Order of the first is very different in a MS. which he hath consulted; and there are some Canons cited by Ivo Carnutensis, under the Name of the Council of Worms, which are not found among these Latter; it may be rationally doubted, whether this Collection of 44, or 80 Canons, were made in this Council of Worms. However that be, these Canons are, almost all of them, found either in more Ancient Councils, or in those about this Time.

The second Council of Douzy.

AN Assembly of Bishops, who met the 13th. of June 876. at Douzy, in the Diocese of Rheims, wrote a Circular Letter to the Bishops of Aquitain, which contains some Laws of the Councils and Popes about Marriages between Relations, and against them who possessed themselves of the Churches-Revenues, that they might deter the Great Lords from those two Disorders, which reigned among them. This Assembly also tried Duda the Nun, who, being ambitious to become an Abbess, combined with the Priest Humbertus, and engaged him to write slanderous Libels against her Abbess, and present them to the King's Commissioners, by whom he was convicted of Falshood and Calumny. After this, he returned to his Monastery, and had such private Commerce with the said Nun, that she became with Child by him: She confessed her Fault, and said, that it was done by the Priest Humbertus; but he denied it. The Council, in the first place, declared, that that Priest, being already convicted of Perjury, and to be a False Accuser, ought not to be believed upon his Denial, nor ought they to refer themselves to his bare Affirmation. Secondly, That before he be judged in the Place, where the Crime was committed, the King should send certain Commissioners into the Monastery, who may examine all the Nuns apart, and enquire out particularly of Duda, the Time and Place, where she committed the Crime with Humbertus; who may also examine her Companions,

and so make that Priest sensible that his Oath is not to be trusted; that if he persist in the Denial, they shall bring him before the Deputies of the Synod, King's Commissioners, Priests, and Clergy of the Monastery, with the Abbess, and her Society. That Duda, and her Companions, being also summon'd thither, shall endeavour to make him own his Crime. But, if he still resolutely deny it, they shall swear Duda and her Companions, and make them bear Witness against him; that, upon their Testimony, he shall be deposed by the Deputies of the Synod, banished by the King's Commissioners, and imprisoned in some Monastery. As for Duda, they ordered, that she should be put to Penance, and scourged by the Abbess, in the Presence of her Sister-Nuns, and shall not be received into Communion till after seven Years Penance. And, as for the two Nuns, who being conscious of Duda's Fault, did not discover it, they judged them Blameworthy; because the Priests, to whom they discovered that Sin, by secret Confession, are obliged to keep it secret; yet there is not the same Obligation of Secrecy upon them, who attain the Knowledge of others Crimes some other Way. Nevertheless, they dealt more mildly with these Nuns, and ordered, that after they have been moderately chastised with a Rod, they shall endure but three Years Penance. This is the Substance of the Relation of this Council, which is full of choice Passages out of the Councils and Fathers, very handsomely and fitly alledged.

The Council of Ravenna.

John the Eighth appointed a Council at Ravenna, where he was to meet the Bishops at the End of May, 877. He came and held a Council there in the Beginning of August, where they made nineteen Canons for the Good of the Church.

The 1st. enjoins, and obligeth all Metropolitans within three Months after their Ordination, to send a Confession of their Faith to the Holy See, and demand the Pall; and they that shall neglect this Duty, shall have no Power to ordain Bishops till they have performed it; and that other Metropolitans shall have Liberty to ordain the Bishops of their Province, after three Admonitions, and having taken the Advice of the Pope.

The 2^d. orders, that if those who are chosen Bishops do not procure Ordination within three Months after their Election, they shall be excommunicated till they do; and if they do not do it within five Months, they shall neither be ordained for the Church, to which they are chosen, nor to any other.

In the 3^d. 'tis forbidden to make use of the Pall in the Streets in Procession, or in any other Ceremonies, than what are appointed by St. Gregory.

The 4th. forbids the Nobles and Judges to contemn or abuse the Bishops, or exact any Thing of them. It reserves the Cognizance of the Causes of the Clergy, Nuns, Orphans and Widows, to the Bishops.

The 5th. is against those that take away the Revenues of the Church.

The 6th. is against Ravishers.

The 7th. is against Murtherers, and Incendiaries.

The 8th. is against those that pillage and steal other Mens Goods.

The 9th. declares them Excommunicate, who voluntarily keep Company with Persons excommunicated; and

requires, that all Audience be denied them who are excommunicated a whole Year, and trouble not themselves to take off their Excommunication; if they die in that Condition, it forbids to accept them to Communion.

That the former Decree may be put in Execution, it is ordered in the following Article, that all the Bishops should send to their Neighbours, and People of their Diocese, the Names of such as are excommunicated, and cause them to set up a List of them upon their Church-doors.

The 11th. imports, that those, who, to avoid deserved Punishment, fly to other Lords, shall not be received, till their Master hath Justice done him.

The 12th. is, that they that absent themselves three Sundays together from the Assemblies of the Faithful in their Parishes, shall be excommunicated.

The 13th. enjoins the Defenders, Preservers and Managers of Church-Revenues, to do their Duty, under the Pain of Excommunication.

The 14th. shews, that he shall not be ordained a Priest, that is not diligent in the Service of the Church.

The three following are for the Preservation of the Laws and Revenues of the Church of Rome.

The 18th. orders, that Tythes shall be paid to the Priest that serves the Parish; and forbids the Priest of another Diocese, or Parish, to meddle with them.

The 19th. forbids the Judges, or King's Commissioners to hold any Pleas, or Lodge in Churches.

At this Council there were present, besides the Pope, the Archbishop of Ravenna, Patriarch of Grado, Bishop of Verona, and six and forty other Bishops of Italy; who signed a Grant, by which they confirmed the Donation of certain Lands and Revenues given to the Church of Autun by King Charles.

The Council of Troyes.

John the Eighth being come into France, to desire the Assistance of Charles the Emperor, called a Council at Troyes in 878. at which were present with the Bishop of Porto, and three other Bishops of Italy, the Archbishops of Rheims, Sens, Lyons, Narbonne, Arles, Tours, Besancon, Vienna, and eighteen other Bishops of France. In it they treated of several Matters. The Bishops approved of the Excommunication of Lambert, and Adelbert; and declared, that they would look upon all those as excommunicated, who had been so by the Pope. They pronounced an Excommunication against those, that had invaded the Goods of the Church. They confirmed the Judgment given against Formosus. They made a Canon, forbidding all Christians to marry a second Wife, while the first is living; and Bishops removing from one Church to another; and, in the Conclusion, made seven Canons. In the first it is commanded, that Secular Noble-men should pay Respect to the Bishops, by not sitting down before them; and, that Laymen should not meddle with Church-Revenues. The second enforces the same Prohibition. The third orders, that the Canons made the Year before at Ravenna, should be observed. The fourth enjoins the Bishops to assist each other in the Defence of the Revenues and Interests of their Churches. The fifth requires, that those Persons, who have been excommunicated, or

subjected to Penance by one Bishop, shall not be received by his Brethren. The sixth asserts, that they will not receive another Man's Servant without his Consent. The seventh says, that they will not entertain a private Accusation against any Man. The Pope having seen the Body of the Gothick and Spanish Laws, brought by the Archbishop of Narbonne, and finding no Law in it against Sacrilege, wrote to them to observe the Law made by Charles the Emperor; who fined such as were guilty of it thirty Pounds. He sent also a Letter to the Bishop of Poitiers forbidding him to encroach upon the Revenues of his Church; and, enjoying all those, that had invaded it, to make Restitution. By another Letter he confirms the Privileges of the Church of Tours, and grants a Privilege to the Monastery of Fleury. Hincmarus, Bishop of Laon, presented a Petition to this Synod, and his Affair was here determined, as we have said. In this Synod King Lewis the Stammerer was crowned by the Pope. They made a Motion to put out Gozelin, Abbot of St. Denys, but 'twas not put in Execution. Lastly, They determined some Affairs concerning the Bishops of Avignon, Troyes, and Besancon. This Council was ended at five Sessions, or Actions, which we have abridged with the seven Canons, and the Decisions of John the Eighth, of which we have spoken.

The Council of Fismes.

IN 881. several Bishops of France met at Fismes, April the 2d. where, after they had recited that excellent Passage of Gelasius, about the Distinction between the Ecclesiastical and Civil Power; and, another Place out of St. Gregory, concerning the Episcopal Vigilance, they admonish King Lewis to preserve, and increase the Honour and Revenues of the Church, and to maintain the Authority of the Bishops. They require, that Monasteries and Nunneries be visited by the King's Commissioners, who

shall represent the State of those Places. They exhort the King to punish Ravishers severely. They also exhort the King's Officers and Judges to hinder Disorders, and punish Crimes. They invite Sinners to Penance; and, Lastly, addressing their Speech to the King, they advise him to provide wise, discreet, and impartial Counsellors, who love Justice and Religion, and will employ their Knowledge and Zeal to suppress Vice.

The Council of Cologne.

IN the Year 887. there was an Assembly held at Cologne, made up of the Archbishops of Mentz and Cologne, four or five Bishops, some Abbots, several Priests and Deacons, and some Laymen, in which Drago, Bishop of Metz was ordained. Afterward they renewed some

Constitutions made against them, who had taken away some Revenues belonging to the Church. Nevertheless they gave them to the End of June, to be received to Penance, if they would come in. They also revived divers other Canons of Councils about unlawful Marriages.

The Council of Mentz in 888.

This Council was called by King Arnoldus at that Time, when Germany was much afflicted by the Inroads of the Normans. The Archbishops of Mentz, Cologne, and Treves were at it, with several of their Suffragans: In it, after they had declared, by way of Preface, the miserable Condition that Germany was reduced to, they made the following Canons.

The 1st. obliges, to pray continually in the Church for King Arnoldus, his Queen, and all Christians.

In the 2d. they give the King a short Abridgment of the chief Duties incumbent on him.

The 3d. shews him, that he is obliged to administer Justice impartially both to Great and Small.

The 4th. says, that they who are Founders of Churches, should leave the Disposal of the Revenues they give, to the Bishops, according to the nineteenth Canon of the third Council of Toledo.

The 5th. enjoins, that no Priests be put into any Church, without the Permission of the Bishop.

The 6th. requires, that those shall be punished as Murderers of the Poor, who detain the Revenues of Churches, Monasteries, or Hospitals.

The 7th. declares, that those, who do any Injury to Clergymen, shall be put out of the Church, till they have made a proportionable Satisfaction.

The 8th. orders, that they who had cut off the Nose of a Priest of the Church of Wirtzburg, should be excommunicated.

The 9th. commands, that Masses shall not be celebrated in all Places; but either in such Places as are consecrated by the Bishop, or are allowed by him for that Use. That in the Places, or Churches burnt by the Normans, Mass may be celebrated in the Chappels, till they are re-built; and that in a Journey, if Men can't find a Church, they may say it in the open Field, or in a Tent, provided they have a consecrated Table for an Altar, and other Things necessary for that Service.

The 10th. enjoins Clergymen absolutely to have no Woman to co-habit with them.

VOL. II.

The 11th. says, that all that invade the Lands of the Church, shall be excommunicated and banish'd.

The 12th. is a Canon falsely attributed to Pope Silvester, about the Accusations of Clergymen.

The 13th. imports, that Ancient Churches shall not be deprived of their Tythes and Revenues to endow new Chappels.

The 14th. holds, that no Bishop can retain, ordain, or judge a Person, that belongs to another Bishop's Diocese.

The 15th. asserts, that he that doth so, shall not be received at a Council, till he hath had a Reproof.

The 16th. imposes a severe and long Penance upon him that shall kill a Priest.

The 17th. orders the Payment of Tythes.

The 18th. is against a Person that had married his God-mother, and being divorced from her, had taken her again.

The 19th. revives some old Laws against unchaste Priests.

The 20th. is against them, who, by their Petitions, get the Revenues of the Church into their Possession by a precarious Title.

The one and twentieth revives the Prohibitions made by Charles the Great, to hold Meetings about Secular Affairs in the Churches, or Church-porches.

The two and twentieth is against those, who defraud the Church of Part of their Tythes.

The three and twentieth ordains, that Ecclesiastical Causes shall be judged by the Bishop, either according to the Deposition of Witnesses; or by the Oath of the Accused, and none shall be admitted for a Witness, unless they be four-teen Years of Age.

The four and twentieth recommends Peace, Unity, and Loyalty to their Prince.

The five and twentieth orders those, who have the Patronage of Monasteries committed to them, to place such Superiors over them as may do their Duty, and will govern such as are subject to their Power, as they ought.

The six and twentieth forbids, that Widows should be easily admitted to the Veil; and declares, that they ought to be left at Liberty, either to marry, or embrace a single

G g

Life,

Life, till their Conversation be approved. If they embrace a single Life, it orders, that they be put into the Monasteries, where they shall live regularly with the Nuns. If they violate their Profession, they shall be punished Ca-

The Council of Metz.

nonically : They renew the Canon of *Elvira*, made concerning Virgins devoted to God, which violate their Vir-

The Council of Metz.

The Council of Metz.

Place this Council after the preceding, because we do not precisely know the Year of its Meeting ; yet it was held under the same Prince by *Rathbodus*, Bishop of *Treves*, and *Robert*, Bishop of *Metz*. The Bishops of *Verdun*, and *Toul*, were present at it, with one Abbot, and several Priests. Many Earls, Lords, and other Persons of Worth were also at it. The following Constitutions were made at it.

The 1st. is a Resolution to endeavour to establish Peace in the Church, promote Piety and Discipline, and hinder the Poor from being pillaged.

The 2^d. provides, that Tythes shall be paid to the Priest that serves the Church, to which they were anciently due, to maintain him ; to furnish the Church with Lights, and Ornaments, and to make necessary Repairs for the Buildings.

The 3^d. requires, that every Priest shall have but one Church, unless there hath been a Chappel annexed to it, Time out of Mind.

The 4th. forbids, that any Tribute shall be exacted for a Farm, or for Slaves belonging to the Church, or for Lands given for a Burial-place ; and that Nothing shall be paid for a Burial.

The 5th. orders, that Priests shall have no Women with them ; no, not so much as their Mother or Sister.

The 6th. enjoins, that Priests shall shew their Bishop the Books, and Sacerdotal Habits ; that they shall keep the Throne under a Key ; that Clergymen shall not bear Arms, nor wear Laymens Habits ; nor Laymen Priests ; that none

shall be admitted for God-fathers, but such as understand the Confession of Faith ; and, that one God-father is sufficient.

The 7th. forbids Christians eating with Jews.

The 8th. orders, that Mass shall not be celebrated in Places which are not consecrated ; and that Bishops shall consecrate those Churches a-new, which have been consecrated by Suffragan Bishops only.

The 9th. commands, that they shall veil, and shut up, in some Monastery, two Nuns of the Monastery of *St. Peter*, who had been put out of it, and unveiled for their Crimes ; and that a Deacon convicted of Sacrilege shall be put in Prison.

The 10th. pronounces Excommunication against some Persons who had guelt a Priest, who would oblige one of their Kinswomen to return to her Husband.

The 11th. excommunicates those Persons, who exercised pillaging in the Province, and did not come to the Synod to acknowledge their Crime. It issues out, in particular, an Excommunication against two private Persons, the one guilty of a Rape committed upon a Nun, the other of Man-slaughter.

The 12th. asserts it to be unlawful to communicate with excommunicated Persons, or give any Tokens of Communion to those, who died under the Bonds of Excommunication.

The 13th. orders Prayers to be made for King *Arnoldus*, with a Fast of three days, and some Processions to obtain of God the Peace and Quiet of the State.

The Council of Vienna.

THE Bishops of the Province of *Arles* made, in 892. some Constitutions like those, which had been made in *Germany*. Two Legates from Pope *Formosus* were present at that Assembly. In it they excommunicated, 1st. those who invaded, or unjustly detained the Revenues of the Church. 2^{dly}. Those, who injured, or a-

Of Vienna

bused the Clergy. 3^{dly}. Those, who misemployed the Alms given by a Bishop, or Priest, in their Sickness. 4^{thly}. It was forbidden Secular Persons to bestow Churches without the Consent of the Diocesan, and to exact any Present of the Priests they put into them. By the 5th. 'tis ordered, that Priests have no Women with them.

Of Vienna

The Council of Tribur.

OF all the Councils held at this Time, there were none so numerous, or that made more considerable Constitutions, than this, which was held in 895. under King *Arnoldus*, at his Palace called *Tribur*, situate near *Metz*. The Archbishops of *Metz*, *Cologne*, and *Treves* were at it, with 19 *German* Bishops. The Constitutions of it are contained in 58 Articles, or Canons, which are set after a long Preface.

The 1st. is only an Invocation of the Spirit of Peace.

In the 2^d. upon Occasion of a Priest, who complained, that a Layman had put out his Eyes, and his Bishop pronounced him innocent, and because the Layman would not appear before him, nor undergo Penance for his Crime, they renewed the Canons which forbid to receive Persons excommunicated by their Bishop, or communicate with them. And, in the following Article they enjoin all the Counts to apprehend the Excommunicate, who will not submit themselves to Penance, and bring them before their Bishop ; that those who are not afraid of the Judgments of God, may be terrified by the Severities of Men. They promise Impunity to them, who slay them, when they defend themselves against their Apprehension, and will not have them obliged to pay the Fine in that Case usually imposed.

The 4th. directs, how the Fine which is to be paid, for hurting and wounding a Priest, shall be employed. If he survive, he shall have it all ; if he dies, it shall be divided into three Parts, and given, one Part to the Church, in which he was ordained, the other to his Bishop, and the third to his Relations.

In the 5th. they impose upon him that kills a Priest, five Years Penance ; during which Time he shall eat no Meat, nor drink any Wine, unless it be on Festivals and *Sundays*. He shall carry no Arms, go always on Foot, and never come into the Church. After these Years are expired, he may come into the Church, but shall not communicate till five Years more be expired ; in which Time he shall keep three Days of Abstinence weekly.

The 6th. condemns him, as guilty of Sacrilege, who enters into the Church-porch with a naked Sword.

The 7th. is against such as violently extort the Goods of the Church.

The 8th. is against those, that will not perform the Penance imposed on them by the Bishop.

The 9th. shews, that if the Bishop and Count call an Assembly both in one day, it is just that the People and Count both should meet at the Bishops ; nevertheless, to prevent such an Accident, and for the Good of Peace, it was ordained, without any Prejudice to the Power and Dignity of the Bishop, that he that first sends out his Summons, shall hold his Court.

The 10th. renews the Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, which orders, that no Bishop shall be deposed, unless it be by twelve others, a Priest by six, and a Deacon by three.

The 11th. inflicts the Punishment of Deposition upon those Deacons and Priests, who have committed Murther, although against their Wills.

The 12th. orders, that the Sacrament of Baptism shall not be administered but at the Solemn Times, *i. e.* at *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*.

The 13th. commands, that the Tythes and Oblations of the Church shall be divided into four Parts, one for the Bishop, two for the Clergy, the third for the Poor, and a fourth for the Reparation of the Church.

The 14th. preserves the Tythes to the ancient Churches, and annexes the Tythes of new broken-up Lands to them ; but if new Houses be built four Miles from other Churches, in a Wood, or other Place, and a Church be built there by the Consent of the Bishop, they may put in a Priest, and give him the new Tythes.

The 15th. says, that the Dead shall be buried, if possible, in the City, or some Monasteries : But, if that can't easily be done, then in the Church, to which they pay their Tythes.

The 16th. forbids exacting any Thing for a Burial.

The 17th. prohibits the Burying of Laymen in Churches.

The 18th. forbids the Use of Wooden Pattins and Chalice.

The 19th. orders, that Water and Wine be mixed in the Chalice, but twice as much Wine as Water.

The 20th. is against them that misuse Clergymen.

The 21st. provides, that no Oaths be required of Priests.

The 22^d. says, that those that are accused of any Crime which they have no Proof of, shall clear themselves by Oath. But if there be any just Cause of Suspicion, they shall undergo the Proof of Red-hot Iron, in the Presence of the Bishop or his Commissioner.

The

The three and twentieth revives the Laws against those who marry Virgins consecrated to God.

The four and twentieth imports, that a Maid, who hath taken the Veil by her own Desire, and without any Constraint, before she is twelve Years old, she is obliged to retain her Virginity, if she hath worn that Habit a Year and a Day, and no Body may take her out of the Monastery.

The twenty fifth forbids Bishops to give the Veil to Widows, and obliges them to a single Life, who have taken it before.

The twenty sixth allows Monks, who will not go out of their Monastery to preserve themselves, or others, to do it with the Consent of the Bishop, Abbot, and their Brethren; but orders those to be punished, who get out to avoid the Severity of the Discipline.

The twenty seventh forbids the Clergy to forsake their Office, and gives the Bishops Power to keep them to it, and take them up, if they are fled to take a Secular Habit.

The twenty ninth forbids that a Slave be ordained till he hath gotten perfect Liberty.

The thirtieth appoints, that in Memory of St. Peter, the Holy Roman and Apostolick See ought be honoured, it being just, that that Church, which is the Mother of the Priestly Dignity, should be the Mistress of Ecclesiastical Order, so that 'tis fit, that Men bear and endure the Yoke she lays upon them, although it be almost insupportable. Nevertheless 'tis ordered, that if any Priest or Deacon be accused of carrying forged Letters from the Pope to stir up any Troubles, or lay any Snares for the Ministers of the Church, the Bishop may, with due Respect to the Pope, stop his Proceedings, till he hath written to the Holy See.

The thirty first is against Thieves.

The thirty second orders, that if the Right of Patronage to any Church be disputed by several Co-heirs which can't agree, to hinder the Disorders which may follow upon it, the Bishop shall remove the Reliques out of the Church, shut it up, and provide that no Mass be celebrated in it, till all the Heirs shall agree together to present one Priest, and that they shall neither put in, nor remove any Priest without the Bishop's Consent.

The thirty third revives those Canons, which exclude such Persons from Holy Orders, as have made themselves Eunuchs, or maimed themselves; but it excepts such from this Law, as have lost any of their Members, or are made lame by any Distemper, or other Accident.

The thirty fourth treats those Men gently, who in the Wars with Barbarians have slain by Chance some Christians, which they took for Pagans, by imposing on them only forty days Penance.

The thirty fifth forbids that any Pleadings or other Civil Assemblies be held on Sundays, Holy-days, Fasts, or in Lent, and commands that all Christians be present on Holy-days and Sundays, at the Vigils, Divine Service, and Mass; and that in Lent, and other Fasts, they fast with Devotion, pray with Zeal and Fervor, and give Alms according to their Abilities.

The thirty sixth declares, that if it happens that a Man, who is cutting down a Tree, and seeing it ready to fall, bids his Companion stand out of the Way, and he doth not do it, but it falls upon him, he that cut down the Tree shall not be reprov'd or blamed for it.

The thirty seventh is a like Case: If a Woman leaves her Child near boiling Water, and the Water still boiling scalds the Child, the Woman shall be put to Penance for her Negligence, but she that set the Water on the Fire hath committed no Fault.

The thirty eighth orders, that every Free-man that marries a Woman made free, shall keep her as his Wife.

The thirty ninth orders the same Thing to such as marry Strangers.

The fortieth declares the Marriage of a Man and a Widow null, who have committed Adultery together in the Life of her Husband, if he hath promised to marry her at that Time.

The forty first imports, that if a Person who is unable to do the Duties of Marriage, marry a Woman, and his Brother abuse her, they shall be parted, and she shall not have Commerce with either of them; nevertheless the Bishop may permit her to marry again, after the guilty Person hath done Penance.

The forty second asserts, that if any Person change his Diocese, after he hath committed Incest, he shall be taken up, and put to Penance by the Bishop of the Place where he committed it.

The forty third is, that if a Person commit Fornication with a Woman, who hath had Carnal Knowledge of his Son or Brother without his Knowledge, and he deposeth upon Oath, that he is not conscious of any such Thing, he may be allowed to marry, after he hath done Penance.

The forty fourth says, that if one Brother marry a Woman, with whom another Brother hath had Carnal Commerce, a severe Penance shall be imposed upon this last, because he did not tell his Brother of it, after which they may marry. As to the Woman, they revived upon her Account the Law of the Council of Neocaesarea.

The forty fifth orders, that he that lies with two Sisters, and the Sister which lies with him last, if she knows that he hath had Commerce with her Sister, shall be put to Penance, and obliged to live a single Life to their Death.

The forty sixth importeth, that if a Woman be prosecuted at Law by her Husband for Adultery, and she hath Recourse to the Bishop, he shall endeavour to obtain of her Husband not to put her to Death, but if he can't prevail, he shall not deliver her into her Husband's Power, but send her whither she desires for her Safety.

The forty seventh allows him, who is God-father to a Man's Child, to marry his Widow, if she was not his God-mother.

The forty eighth imports, that if a Man by Chance marry the Daughter of his God-mother, he may keep her and live with her, as with his Wife.

The forty ninth forbids, that such as have committed Adultery together, should ever marry, dwell, or have Society together. If they have any Estate, it shall be preserved for the Adulterous Off-Spring.

The fiftieth is against those who pervert Christians, and destroy them by their evil Arts.

The fifty first repeats the Prohibitions made to an Adulterer, to marry the Woman with whom he hath committed Adultery, after her Husband's Death.

The fifty second leaves it in the Power of the Bishop, to regulate the Time of Penance for involuntary Man-slayers.

The fifty fourth to the fifty eighth, which is the last, appoint the Time and Manner of Penance for wilful Murderers, viz. seven Years. For the first forty days, the Guilty shall not go into the Church, eat Nothing but Bread and Salt, and drink Nothing but Water. He shall go bare footed, having his Thighs only covered, he shall not lie with his Wife, he shall not converse with other Men; after this, he shall not enter into the Church for a whole Year, all which Time, he shall abstain from Meat, Cheese, drinking Wine, Metheglin and Beer, unless upon Holy-days, or in a Journey, or in Sickness, in which Case he shall buy off the Fasts of Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday, by giving a Penny to the Poor, and maintaining three poor People. After this Year, he may go into the Church, with other Penitents, but he shall observe the same Abstinences, for the second and third Years, saving that he may for all that Time buy off the three days aforesaid. In the four last Years, he shall make three Lents, the one before Easter, in which he shall abstain from Cheese, Fish and Wine. The second before the Nativity of St. John Baptist, and the third before the Nativity of Christ, in which he shall practise the same Abstinences. He may eat the rest of the Year, what he pleases, on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, and buy off Monday and Wednesday for a Penny, but he shall keep a strict Fast on Friday. When the seven Years are over, if he hath observed these Penances exactly, he shall be reconciled as the Penitents are, and be admitted to partake of the Communion.

The Council of Nantes.

THE Canons which bear the name of the Council of Nantes, are only a Collection of several Constitutions made at different Places.

The first orders, that the Priests on Sundays and Holy-days shall demand of the People before they say Mass, whether there be any Person of another Parish, who is come to hear Mass in Contempt of his own Priest; and if they find any, they shall put them out of the Church, and oblige them to return to their own Parish. They shall also ask, if there be any Person at Variance, and in Quarrels, and if they find any, they shall cause them to be reconciled immediately, which if they refuse to be, they shall also put them out of the Church, till they shall be reconciled, because they cannot bring their Offering to the Altar, till

they be reconciled to their Brother. This being done, the Priest shall say Mass.

The 2d. forbids all Priests to receive the Parishioners of another, unless he be in a Voyage, or come to some Court.

The 3d. forbids a Priest to have any Woman with him, yea, those that are accepted by the Canons. It forbids also Women to approach the Altar, officiate as Priests, or to sit within the Rails.

The 4th. contains Directions, what a Priest ought to do when he hears that any Person is sick in his Parish. He ought to go immediately to see him, and when he enters into his Chamber, sprinkle Holy-Water, singing the Anthem, *Asperges me Domine, Thou shalt sprinkle me, O Lord, &c.* Psal. 51. 7. Then he shall say the Lord's Prayer, the

The Council of Nantes. Seven Psalms, and the Prayers for the Sick. After this, he shall cause all that are in the Chamber to go out, and coming to the Bed of the Sick-man, he shall speak comfortably to him, and exhort him to put his whole Trust in God, to bear patiently the Afflictions he hath laid upon him, to confess his Sins, and to resolve fully upon a thorough Conversion; if God restores him to his Health, to promise, that he will do Penance, to dispose of his Goods, and set his Worldly Affairs in Order, while he is of a sound Mind, to redeem his Sins by Alms, to pardon those that have injured him, to make a Confession of the Faith of the Church, and not to despair of the Mercy of God. After he hath given him these Exhortations, he shall give him his Blessing, and then shall retire to leave the Sick-man to think of his Sins.

The 5th. imports, that the Priest who shall receive the Confession of a Sick-man, shall not bestow Absolution upon him, but upon Condition, that if God shall restore him to his Health, he will undergo Penance proportionable to his Faults.

The 6th. forbids taking any Thing for Burials, and burying in the Church, near the Altar.

The 7th. forbids all Ministers of the Church to favour secret and clandestine Ordinations of any of the Clergy of another Diocese.

The 8th. forbids a Priest to have more than one Church, unless he have other Priests under him in every of those Churches, who shall recite the Office day and night, and celebrate Mass in them every day.

The 9th. commands, that the Bread be blessed that is distributed to the People. This is one of the Articles of *Hincmarus's* Constitutions made 852.

The 10th. is about the Revenues of the Church, what Use they ought to be put to, and how distributed into four Parts.

The 11th. orders, that when the Bishop designs to make an Ordination, he shall cause all those who are to be ordained, to come to the City the *Wednesday* before the Or-

The Council of Nantes. dination, with the Archpriests who are to present them. That afterward he shall send some Priests, and other discreet Persons, to get Information of their Life, Education, Birth, Manners, and Capacity; that he shall have them examined three days together, and on *Saturday* ordain those he finds worthy.

The 12th. allows a Man to put away his Wife for Adultery, but not to marry another in her Life-time. He may be reconciled to her, but on Condition that he do Penance with her.

The 13th. imposes three Years Penance for single Fornication.

The 14th. imposes seven Years Penance upon a married Person, that hath committed Adultery; and five on him that is not married.

The 15th. regulates the Practices of Fraternities, and takes away Abuses. This is copied out of *Hincmarus's* Constitutions.

The next is an Extract from the same Author: In it a Priest is forbidden to sue for another Church besides what he has, and give Presents to the Lord to attain it.

The 17th. lays 14 Years Penance upon a voluntary and publick Murderer, viz. five Years in which he shall be separated from the Church; the rest of the Time he may be at Prayers, but without Offering, or Communicating.

The 18th. imposeth five Years Penance upon an involuntary Murderer; forty days Fast with Bread and Water, two Years Separation from the Prayers of the Faithful, and three Years without Communicating. It leaves it to the Priest to prescribe the Abstinence as he thinks convenient.

The 19th. forbids Nuns and Widows to be present at Pleadings, or any publick Assemblies, if they are not summoned by the Prince or Bishop, or have no necessary Business, in which Case they ought to have the Permission of the Bishop.

The 20th. commands, that Bishops and their Ministers should use their utmost Endeavours to abolish the Reminders of Idolatry in all Places.

A Letter from the Clergy of Ravenna to Charles the Younger.

A Letter from the Clergy of Ravenna to Charles the Younger. Charles the Younger had consulted the Clergy of *Ravenna*, to know, whether the Monks, which were raised to Ecclesiastical Dignities, ought to wear Clergymens Habit, or keep to their Monks Garb. In Answer to him, they brought several Authorities of the Popes, to shew, that Clergymen and Monks ought not so much to be distinguished by their Habits, as by their holy Lives and Profession. Then they say, that it doth not seem contrary to the Laws of the Church, that the Monks who are made Bishops, may wear the same Habits with other Bishops, according to the Practice of the Church of *Rome*; and they

think, that such an Uniformity is much better, than if they were distinguished, as they are in the *Greek Church*. That nevertheless they do not think that it ought to be a Law to all Churches, because every one may have its particular Customs. But yet they can't condemn the Practice of the *Italian Bishops*, and that it is convenient to uphold it, and to oblige all Monks that are ordained Bishops, to wear the Stole, i. e. a long Garment, in Honour to the Priesthood; although they are not thereby dispensed with to neglect the Practice of their Rule. Lastly, That we must follow in such Things the Custom that is anciently settled in the Church,

The Letter of the Bishops of Germany to John ^(a) IX.

The Letter of the Bishops of Germany to John IX. This Letter is written in the Name of the Bishops, Clergy, and People of *Bavaria*. They tell the Pope, that having heard of their Predecessors, that the Bishop of *Rome* hath been always careful to promote the Peace, Union, and Discipline of every Church; they cannot believe that which is daily reported, That there is lately come out from the Holy Apostolick See, which is the Original of the Christian Religion, and the Source of the Priestly Dignity, a Decree both unjust in it self, and contrary to the Doctrine and Authority of the Church; but that three Bishops, who pretend themselves his Legates to the *Slavonians* and *Moravians*, have raised that Report. That these People were heretofore subject to their Prince and the Bishops, that had converted them; That the Bishop of *Passau* had always conversed freely with them, and held Synods there, till they revolted, and forsook Christianity; That since they brag, that they have obtained of the Pope, by their Money, to send three Bishops, who have attempted to do a Thing in the Bishoprick of *Passau*, which they could not think the Holy See would be the Author of, and which is directly contrary to the Order of the Canons, viz. To divide that Bishoprick into five Parts, and place an Archbishop, and three Bishops in that Diocese, without the Consent of the Bishop. They cite the two Canons of a Council

The Letter of the Bishops of Germany to John IX. of *Africa*, and some Places in the Popes, *Leo*, and *Celestine's* Letters. They add, that his Predecessor consecrated *Wicbertus* Bishop at the Desire of the Duke *Zuentibaudus*; but that he sent him into a conquer'd Country, and not into the Duchy of *Passau*. They complain also, that his Legates giving Credit to the Relations of the *Slavonians*, accused them of many false Things. They take Notice, that their Prince is descended of the Family of the Kings of *France*, who are Christians; whereas the *Moravians* and *Slavonians* are originally *Pagans*, and Enemies to the Christian Religion. They commend their King *Lewis*, and shew the great Inclination he hath to the Holy See, and for Religion. They confute the Reports the *Slavonians* had given out, that they had made a League, in a profane Manner, with the *Hungarians*, who have pillaged, burnt and sacked the Country. That, on the contrary, they had a Design of hindring them from entering into *Italy*, and to send some Succours into *Lombardy*; and to put themselves into a Condition to do it, they had desired a League with the *Slavonians*, but could not obtain it. They conclude, with an earnest Request to the Pope, not to believe the Calumnies which the *Slavonians* spread abroad against them, and to endeavour the Peace of the Church.

(a) For altho' the Title bears *John VIII.* this Letter cou'd not have been directed to any other than *John IX.* because Mention is there made of *Zuentibaud*, who had demanded a

Bishop from the Predecessor of the Pope, to whom the Letter was written. *Zuentibaud*, or *Zuentibold* was not elected King of *Lorraine* till the Year 895. after the Pontificate of *John VIII.*

C H A P. XII.

The Constitutions of some Bishops, and Collections of Canons, concerning the Discipline of the Church.

Of the Constitutions and Canons concerning the Discipline of the Church.
BESIDES the Constitutions made by the Bishops assembled in Councils for the Reformation of Church-Discipline, several Bishops were at the Pains to make particular Constitutions for their own Dioceses, and Treatises for the Instruction of their Clergy. They also, at the same Time, made several Collections of Canons about Penance, and other Ecclesiastical Matters. The chief Tracts, which relate to the Matters, and the Authors of this Age, which composed them, are these that follow.

Hatto. **Hatto**, or *Hetto*, chosen in 796. Abbot of the Monastery of *Angia Dives*, of which he was a Monk, and afterwards Bishop of *Basil* in 801. was sent by *Charles the Great*, in the Year 811. to the *Greek* Emperor, to make a Peace, and settle the Bounds of both Empires. He wrote a Relation of his Voyage, but it is lost. He composed a Book of Constitutions for the Instruction of the Priests of his Diocese, put out by Father *Dacherius*, in *Tom. 6.* of his *Spicilegium*, and inserted in the last Collection of the Councils.

This Book contains 25 Articles. 1. That Priests shall understand well the Doctrine of the Faith. 2. That they shall teach the People the Creed, and Lord's Prayer in *Latin*, and their Mother-Tongue. 3. That they shall teach them to say the Responses after the Priest in Divine Service. 4. That the Priests shall understand the Nature of the Sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Lord's Supper; and that by the mysterious Use of a visible Creature, the Salvation of the Soul is further'd. 5. That they shall have Books necessary for their Office, viz. A Book for Celebration of Sacraments, a Book of the Lessons, Anthems, Administration of Baptism, a Calendar, and Homilies for all the Year. 6. That they shall recite *St. Athanasius's* Creed at the Prime. 7. That they shall have Notice of the solemn Times for Baptism, as *Holy Saturday*, and the *Saturday* before *Whitsuntide*, although in Cases of Necessity, Baptism may be administered at all Times. He observes, that they used three Dippings, and had in their Fonts a Vessel, which they used only to baptize in. 8. That they should know all the Days in the Year, which they are to keep Holy, viz. All the *Sundays* in the Year, from Morning to Night; our Lord's Nativity, *St. Stephen's*, *St. John's*, *St. Innocent's*, *Circumcision*, *Epiphany*, *Purification*, *Easter*, *Ascension*, *Holy Saturday*, *Whitsuntide*, *St. John Baptist*, the *XII Apostles*, and chiefly *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*; the *Assumption* of the *Virgin Mary*, the Dedication of *St. Michael's* Church, and all other Churches; the Feast of every Saint, in Honour of whom any Church is founded. That they ought to observe the Fasts appointed by the Prince; but as to the Festivals of *St. Remedius*, *St. Maurice*, and *St. Martin*, the People ought not to be forced to keep them, nor hindred, if their Devotion leads them to it. 9. That Clergymen ought not to have Women, that are related to them, with them. 10. Nor go to Taverns. 11. Nor frequent Courts of Judicature, nor be Bail, nor go a Hunting. 12. That they should know, that none ought to be ordained for Money, and if any Man be, he ought to be deposed, as well as he that ordained him. 13. That no Body ought to receive, nor employ a Clergyman of another Diocese, without the Consent of his Bishop. 14. That they ought not to celebrate Mass in private Houses, or unconsecrated Churches, unless in Respect to the Sick. 15. That Tythes ought to be paid, the third Part of which belongs to the Bishop, according to the Council of *Toledo*; that, as for himself, he was contented with a fourth Part, according to the Constitutions of the *Roman* Bishops, and the Use of the Church of *Rome*. 16. That Women ought not to come near the Altar, nor do any Offices about it. That when they are to wash the Vessels, and Church, the Clerks shall take them from the Altar, and deliver them to the Women at the Rails of the Altar, whither they shall bring them again; and the Priests shall also receive there the Offerings of the Women, to carry them to the Altar. 17. That Priests shall preach both by their Word and Example, that Men ought not to be Usurers. 18. That no Clergyman, ordained, or to be ordained, shall go out of his own Diocese, either to *Rome*, or to Court, or to obtain Absolution, without the Allowance of his Bishop; and that they shall admonish them, that will go to *Rome* out of Devotion, that they ought not to go, till they have confessed their Sins in their Diocese, because they ought to be

bound, or loosed by their own Bishop, and not by a Stranger. 19. That Nothing shall be sung, or read in the Church, which is not taken out of Scripture, or the Writings of the Orthodox Fathers. That they shall not honour any unknown Angels, but only *St. Michael*, *St. Gabriel*, and *St. Raphael*. That Priests shall all have one Way of Administering Penance, and shall impose it according to the Nature of Mens Faults. 20. That they shall put the Offerings of the Faithful to a good Use. 21. That they shall not suffer a Contract of Marriage between Relations to the fifth Degree; but nevertheless those that are married in the fourth Degree shall not be parted, but put to Penance so long as they continue together. That it is not lawful to marry the Relations of a first Husband, or first Wife; also a God-son, or God-daughter at Baptism, or Confirmation: That they who have committed Fornication with a Relation in the first Degree, may not continue together, that they shall be put to Penance, and parted; but they may marry others. That Slaves may not marry, without the Consent of their Masters; and if they do, the Marriage is null. 22. That Priests shall teach their People to do Works of Mercy, instruct them in Virtue, and win them from Vice, but chiefly from Perjury. 23. That they shall officiate in the Churches they are appointed. 24. That they shall not fail to say the Canonical Hours both by day and night. 25. That they shall admonish God-fathers and God-mothers, that they are obliged to make their God-sons and God-daughters, when they are at Age of Discretion, to be sensible of the Promise they have made for them. These Constitutions shew, how prudent and wise a Man this good Bishop *Hatto* was. Being very aged, he laid down the Government both of his Diocese and Monastery, which he had always held with it, in 823. and lived a private Monk the rest of his Life. He died in 836. He also wrote a Relation of the Visions of *St. Wettinus*, or *Guetinus*, a Monk of the same Abby, which are also mention'd by *Strabo*. [This Tract is printed among the Visions of *Hildegardes*, and other Religious Men, at *Paris*, 1513. and by *F. Mabillon*, *Sæc. Benedict.* 4. p. 1.

This is a proper Place to treat of the Writings of *Agobardus*, which, for the most Part, concern the Discipline of the Church. The Life of this Author is very obscure; some think him a *Frenchman*, though they have no clear Proof of it. He was *Coadjutor*. (a) or rather a *Suffragan* of *Leidradus*, Archbishop of *Lyons*; who being desirous to retreat into the Monastery of *Soissons*, in the Beginning of the Empire of *Lewis the Godly*, *Agobardus* was put in his Place by the Consent of the Emperor, and (b) a whole Synod of *France*, which approved of the Choice, that *Leidradus* had made of him for his Successor. But this Ordination was afterward found Fault with, because 'tis against the Canons for a Bishop to choose his Successor; a Rule, which it is very dangerous to break. Nevertheless *Agobard* enjoyed his See peaceably, till he was put out by *Lewis the Godly* for taking Part with his Son *Lotharius*, and having been one of the principal Authors of his Deposition, at an Assembly of Bishops held at *Compeigne*, in 833. for *Lewis the Godly* punishing the Injustice, and Violence, which had been done to him by *Lotharius*, and the Bishops of his Party, had a Process drawn up against them at a Council of *Thionville* held in 835. *Ebbo*, who was Archbishop of *Rheims*, was forced to confess his Fault, and submit himself to his Deposition. *Agobardus*, who fled into *Italy*, with the other Bishops of his Party, was cited to the Council three Times; and, not appearing, was deposed. The Examination of their Cause was begun the next Year, at an Assembly held near *Lyons*, but was left undetermined, by Reason of the Absence of the Bishops, to whom alone it belonged to depose their Brethren. Lastly, The Children of *Lewis the Godly* having made Peace with him; they obtained, that *Agobardus* should be restored; and he was present at a Synod held at *Paris*, by the Order of *Lewis the Godly*. He likewise obtained the Favour of that Emperor, with whom he died at *Xaintonge* in 840. on the 15th. day of *June*.

This Bishop had no less Share in the Affairs of the Church of his Time, than in those of the Empire, and hath shewn, by his Writings and Government, that he was not more learned and skilful in Divinity, than expert in Politick Affairs. The Catalogue, and Extract of his Works follow.

(a) Or rather a *Suffragan*.] We ought to read *Chorepiscopus* in *Ado*, as it is in the *Chronicon* of *Hugo Flaviniacensis*, and not *Co-episcopus*; because if he had been *Co-episcopus*, or *Coadjutor*, there had been no need of ordaining him a-new, when *Leidradus* retired. And 'tis certain there were at this Time *Suffragans* in *France*.

(b) A whole Synod.] What Synod it was is not known. *M. Baluzius* believes it was that of *Metz*, in 813. but this Synod was under *Charles the Great*; and *Leidradus* did not retire, and so *Agobard* could not be ordained, till the Reign of *Lewis the Godly*.

His Treatise against *Felix Orgelitanus* is dedicated to *Lewis the Godly*. In it he explains the Tract of *Felix*, which he composed by Way of Question and Answer, and published, against what *Agobardus* had asserted in the City of *Lyons*, where he was then in Banishment, after the Recantation he had made of his Error at the Council of *Aix la Chapelle*. *Agobard* observes, that *Felix* had suppressed several Expressions, which he had used before, and had added new Errors. He acknowledged, that that Bishop lived a very holy Life; but says, that we must judge of a Man's Faith, not by the Holiness of his Life, but of his Manners by his Faith. *Non est vitâ hominis metienda fides, sed ex fide probanda est vita*. He excuses the Plainness of his Style, and prays them, who will take the Pains to read his Writings, to content themselves with the Consideration of the Passages of the Fathers which he hath cited, and to compare *Felix's* Opinion with them. After he hath spoken in general of the Error of *Nestorius* and *Eutychius*, he says, that he hath heard that *Felix*, in his Life-time, did teach, That Jesus Christ, as Man, was ignorant of many Things; as of the Place where *Lazarus* was buried; because he asked his Sisters, where they had laid him; the Day of Judgment; the Discourse which the Disciples, that went to *Eminans*, had together; the Love *St. Peter* had for him. That *Agobard*, knowing that he taught these Things, found them out, reproved him for them, explained those Places to him, and sent him several Passages of the Fathers, contrary to those Errors; that having read them, he promised to amend them; that Things remaining thus, he did not think it his Duty to publish the Errors asserted by him, because it did not concern him to do it. But after his Death, some of the Faithful told him, that he had asserted, That it was not certain that the Son of God suffer'd, or was fixed to the Cross, but that ought to be affirmed of the Manhood only, which he had assumed; an Error, which arises from the Ignorance of the Substantial Union of the Word with the Flesh, although he seemed to admit but one Person only in the Person of Jesus Christ. He shews, that *Nestorius* spake after the same Manner. He consults that Assertion of *Felix*, That in the Nativity of the true Son of God, of the Substance of his Father, his Nature preceded his Will; so that he is necessarily the Son of God: But in his Humane Nativity, it was from his Will, and not from Necessity, that he was the Son of God. — *Agobardus* affirms, that this Expression makes Jesus Christ to be believed not to be the true and natural Son of God. He also blames *Felix* for teaching, that though the Virgin *Mary* be the Mother of God, yet she is otherwise the Mother of the Man, than of God. He says, that this Expression is not only new, and not heard of before, but impious. That the Virgin can't be one Way the Mother of the Godhead, and another of the Manhood in Jesus Christ, since she was the Mother of a God-Man at the same Time, and the Divinity and Humanity make but one Person in Jesus Christ. He also opposes that Opinion of *Felix*, that Jesus Christ was different Ways the Son of God according to his different Natures; That according to his Divinity, he was a Son by Nature, in Truth and Substance, whereas according to his Humanity, he was a Son only by Grace, Election, Will, Predetermination and Assumption. From this Principle he draws this Consequence, That since Jesus Christ is a Natural Son in one Sense, and an Adoptive in another, we must acknowledge two Sons and two Persons. 'Tis true, that *Felix* disowns this Consequence, but *Agobard* affirms it to follow directly from his Doctrine, and says, that *Nestorius* used that very Expression. He confutes this Principle, and the Consequences *Felix* draws from it by several Passages of the Fathers. And lastly, answers to those that *Felix* had alledged to prove the Adoption of Jesus Christ; shewing that the Fathers never said, that Jesus Christ was an Adoptive Son, but that the Humane Nature was adopted by the Divine, i. e. the Divine Nature was united with the Humane, so that the Person made up of both Natures, was the true and natural Son of God, and not merely by Adoption and Grace.

The Book of *Agobard* concerning the Insolence of the *Jews*, is a Petition addressed to *Lewis the Godly*, in which he complains, that the Commissioners which he had sent to *Lyons*, took Part with the *Jews* against the Church, and had sealed Letters and Ordinances bearing his Name, which were favourable to them. They had carried the Business so far, that they spoke openly in Favour of the *Jews*, and so threatened some Bishops. *Agobard*, who was absent when this happened, being gone to the Monastery of *Nantone* to accommodate a Difference that had happened among the Monks, wrote about it to the Commissioners, but they had no Regard to his Letters; whereupon he addressed himself to the Emperor, and represented it to him, that the *Jews* did persecute him and his Fellow-Bishops, because he preached to the Christians, that they should not sell any Slaves to the *Jews*, nor suffer the *Jews* to sell Christians into *Spain*, nor keep Christians for their Household Servants, nor to suffer Christian Women to keep the *Jewish* Sabbath, nor the *Jews* to labour or trade on the Lord's Day, nor to eat in Lent

with them, nor to eat any Flesh they have killed, nor drink any Wine that they sell. Lastly, not to converse familiarly with them, nor trade with them, because they daily blaspheme the Name of Christ. Then he describes the Insolence of the *Jews*, because they found themselves upheld by the Authority of the Commissioners. He beseeches him to hear the humble Entreaty of himself and Brethren, and rectify this Disorder.

To this Petition he joyns a Letter written in his Name, and in the Name of *Bernard*, Archbishop of *Vienna*, and another Bishop called *Eaof* or *Taof*, in which they produce the Authorities of the Fathers and Scripture, to justify the Severity they treated the *Jews* withal. They relate the Example of *St. Hilary*, who would not salute them; of *St. Ambrose*, who writes, that he would rather suffer Death, than rebuild a Synagogue of the *Jews*, which the Christians had burnt. They add to these two Fathers *St. Cyprian* and *St. Athanasius*, who wrote against the *Jews*: Then they alledge the Canons of the Councils of *Spain* and *Agda*, which forbid Christians to eat with the *Jews*, and the Constitutions of the first Council of *Mascon*, which declare, that according to the Edict of *Childebert*, it is not permitted to the *Jews* to be Judges, or Receivers of the Publick Revenues, nor to appear in Publick in the Holy Week, and renew the Prohibition given the Christians not to eat with them. This is confirmed by the Canons of the first and third Councils of *Orleans*, and the Council of *Laodicea*, which forbids Christians to converse with them. They forget not the Action of *St. John*, who fled from the *Bath*, in which he saw *Cerintus* the Heretick entered, who was an Heretick of the Sect of the *Jews*. They accuse the *Jews* of their Time to be worse than *Cerintus*, because they believed God Corporeal, and had gross and false Notions of the Divinity, allowed an infinite Number of Letters, and believed the Law to be written several Years before the World, were persuaded that there are several Worlds and Earths, introduced many Fables about the Old Testament, and uttered Blasphemy against Jesus Christ, published the false Acts of *Pilate*, used the Christians as Idolaters, because they hated the Saints, and did infamous Actions in their Synagogues, from whence they conclude, that if they ought to separate themselves from Hereticks, they ought with more Reason to have no Commerce with the *Jews*, which they maintain by several Passages of Holy Scripture.

'Tis very probable, that *Agobard* went to Court about this Business. He apply'd himself to three Persons, who were in great Favour at Court, viz. *Adelardus* Abbot of *Corbey*, *Vala* the Son of *Bernard*, Brother of *Pepin*, and a Relation to the Emperor, and *Helesacharius* Abbot of *St. Maximus* at *Treves*, having complained before them of those that defended the *Jews*, they brought him into the King's Presence to relate it, but he received no Satisfaction, and was ordered to withdraw. Being returned, he consulted those three Persons by a Letter, what he should do with those *Jewish* Slaves, who desired to become Christians and be baptized. He shews by several Reasons that he could not refuse to do it; and that the *Jews* might have no Ground of Complaint, he says that he offer'd to pay them for those Slaves, what was ordered by the ancient Laws. But since the *Jews* would not receive that Price, because they were persuaded that the Court Officers were their Friends, he prays them to whom he wrote to direct him what to do upon that Occasion, about which he was much perplexed, fearing on the one Side Damnation, if he deny'd Baptism to the *Jews*, or their Slaves who desired it; and on the other Side, being fearful of offending the great Men, if he granted it to them.

In *Agobard's* Letter to *Nebridius* Archbishop of *Narbonne*, he shews how dangerous it is to hold a familiar Converse with the *Jews*, and tells him, that he hath admonished his People of it all along his Visitation of his Diocese, and boldly opposed the Attempts of the Emperor's Commissioners.

Agobard presented another Petition to *Lewis the Godly*, in which he prays him to abolish the Law of *Gundobadus*, which ordered, that private Contentions and Differences should be decided by a single Combate, or some other Proofs, rather than by the Deposition of Witnesses. He shews, that that Law which was made by an *Arian* Prince, is contrary to the Spirit of the Gospel; to that Charity that Christians ought to have one for another, and to the Peace both of Church and State. He observes, that it came neither from the Law nor Gospel; That the Christian Religion was not established by such Sort of Combates; but on the Contrary, by the Death of him that preached it; That the most Wicked and Guilty have often overcome the more Just and Innocent. He adds, that *Avitus* Bishop of *Vienna*, who had some Conferences about Religion with *Gundobadus*, and converted his Son *Sigismund*, disallowed this Custom. He complains of the little Regard had to the Canons of the Church of *France*. Lastly, he says, he could wish that all the King's Subjects had but one Law, but because he believed that impossible, he desired he would abolish at least that Custom, which was so unjust and so prejudicial to the State.

In the Treatise of the Privileges and Rights of the Priesthood, dedicated to *Bernard* Bishop of *Vienna*. *Agobard* treats of

Of the
Constitu-
tions and
Canons
concerning
the Disci-
pline of the
Church.

of the Excellency of the Priesthood. He says, that all Christians being Members of Jesus Christ, who is our chief Priest, are Kings and Priests of the Lord. That in the Beginning of the World, the First-born were Priests, and Sacrificers. There he produces several Examples taken out of the Holy Scripture, and many Authorities to shew that God hath often heard wicked Priests, and had no Regard to the Sacrifices of good ones, because he looks chiefly upon the Dispositions of the Heart of those for whom they offer Sacrifices, and that otherwise 'tis not the Merit of the Priest, nor his Person that God respects, but his Ministry and Priesthood. For this Reason it is, that wicked Priests may administer Sacraments, which the most holy Laymen cannot do. And upon this Account, Men ought to hear and believe what the Priest teacheth, if he do not corrupt the Doctrine of Jesus Christ, for if he teach any Thing that Christ hath not commanded, he that hears him, saith *Agobard*, is a Leper, that follows another Leper, a blind Man, led by another blind Man, and consequently both of them ought to be driven out of the Camp, and shall both fall into the Ditch. This gives him Occasion to cite several Texts of Scripture, to exhort the Priests of the New Testament to behave themselves worthy of their Ministry, and to complain of the Irregularities of his Time. He observes that the great Lords of his Time kept Domestick Priests in their Houses, not to obey them, but to employ them as they pleased, as well in Temporal as Spiritual Services; inasmuch says he, that some Priests wait at Table, provide Meat and Drink, look after Dogs and Horses, and take Care of their Farms in the Country. And because they can't find any good Clergymen, who will so dishonour their Calling, they take such as come next, without regarding whether they are ignorant and worthless, and guilty of many Crimes. They only desire to have some Priests with them, that they may leave the Churches and Publick Offices to them. And when they have a mind to have them ordained, they come and say in an imperious Way, I have a little Clergyman whom I have brought up, who is the Son of one of my Waiting-men or Tenants, I desire you to make him a Priest, and when they have got him ordained, they think that they have no need of the Curates, and never come to the Service of a Parish-Church, nor Exhortations made there. He crys out against this Abuse, and bewails the Badness of his Time, in which the Bishops were not allowed to reprove their Irregularities, as by their Office they are obliged. Lastly, he exhorts the Laity to have Respect to the Sacraments, which are administered by the Priests. For says he, the Holy Sacraments, Baptism, and the Consecration of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and the rest, which give Life and Salvation to the Faithful, are so Great and Holy, that they cannot become more excellent, by Reason of the Holiness of good Ministers, nor worse by the Impiety of wicked ones, because they operate not by the Vertue of Men, but by the Majesty of the Holy Spirit, when the Priest hath made his Invocation; whereupon he cites several Passages of *St. Austine*, *Gelasius* and *Pope Anastasius*, and advises the Bishops to be careful, that they be not Partakers of other Mens Sins, by ordaining such Persons Priests, as are vicious, ignorant, and unable to discharge their Ministry well. He says, that the Learning of Ministers is more to be regarded than their Manners, because though a Priest ought to be blameless in both, yet 'tis less dangerous, to have a Priest that teaches well and lives ill, than to have the Ignorant though they live well. Lastly, he distinguishes Ministers into four Sorts, 1. Such as are to be loved, who live well and teach well. 2. Tolerable, such as teach well but live ill, or who live well, but have not Learning enough to instruct others. 3. The Contemptible, who live ill and are ignorant. 4. Such as are accursed, who live either well or ill, and teach Heresies. In the Conclusion, he prays God to pour his Graces upon the Priests of his Church, that they may carry themselves so, as becomes their Ministry.

Nothing is more judicious, than the next Treatise of *Agobard's*, which he wrote to undeceive the People, and remove the Opinions they had, that *Sorterers* could raise Tempests, cause Thunder, and bring Hail by their Inchantments. He proves by several Texts of Scripture, that it is great Folly, and a Kind of Sacrilege to attribute to Men, that which belongs to God. He laughs at the Fancy of some, who supposed that there was a Region in the Air, whither they convey'd the Corn and Fruit, which the Hail beat down. He shews by several Texts of Scripture, that God only is the Cause of Thunder and Hail, that he punishes Men by these Plagues; That all that is done in the Air, is the Effect of his Power, whether done by Himself, or Angels, or Men; That he alone is the Mover and Creator of the Universe; That if wicked Men had Power to afflict and destroy other Men, all their Enemies would be so dealt with; That he understood not how Men had Power to disturb the Air, or Heaven, whose Nature they are ignorant of; That most of the Histories written upon this Subject being examined, will be found false, although there be some People so ignorant as to expose themselves to Death

to maintain them, as it happen'd a little before, when they accused *Grimoaldus* Duke of *Beneventum*, of having scattered a Powder through the whole Country, which made all the Oxen die. As if, says he, he could make a Powder, which should kill Oxen only, and not other Beasts, or could make such Quantities of it, and have Sowers enough to scatter it through the whole Country.

Fredegisus, Abbot of *St. Martin's* at *Tours*, having found Fault with some Passages in one of *Agobard's* Books; he thought himself obliged to defend himself and answer that Abbot's Objections. The first Expression of *Agobard's* which he reprov'd was, that the humble Man who hath mean Thoughts of himself, is subject to Error. *Fredegisus* says, That Jesus Christ was humble, and yet 'tis certain, he was not subject to Error. *Agobard* answers, That his Maximi ought not to be understood of Jesus Christ, who abased and humbled himself voluntarily without ceasing to be omnipotent and sinless; but he confirms it in respect of all other Men, who are subject to Error and Sin.

Secondly, *Fredegisus* accuses him of weakening the Authority of Scripture, and of the Interpretation of it, because he had observed, that they did not always observe the Rules of Grammar. *Agobard* answers, That that ought not to make those Things doubted of, which are related in Holy Scripture, that the Interpreters have used so to do, either to accommodate themselves to the Capacity of the Simple, or to express the Sense of the Original the better. That it is not allowable to doubt of the Authority of those Authors, of whom the Holy Spirit hath made Use to write the Canonical Books, or believe that they ought to have written otherwise than they have. That, next to the Original, the Authority of the Translation of the Seventy ought to be acknowledged, and the Fidelity of *St. Jerome's Latin Version* upon the Hebrew Text, and that the *Latin Versions* made by *Orthodox* Christians out of the Seventy, are not to be contemned, but there are several Translations which are justly to be corrected and reprov'd, as those of those famous Hereticks, and Bastard Jews, *Aquila*, *Theodotion*, and *Symmachus*, as also certain *Latin* Interpreters reprov'd by *St. Jerome*. And Lastly, as to Commentators, Men ought to follow the Rule of *St. Austine*, who gives all Liberty to judge of them, and reject what is not Orthodox and True in their Writings. Afterwards examining particularly the Question about the Holy Books, he says, 'tis absurd to believe, that the Holy Ghost did inspire the Prophets and Apostles, with the Words and Terms which they used; and to prove this, he alledgeth the Example of *Moses*, who says, that he was of a slow Speech. He produces the Testimonies of *St. Jerome*, who acknowledgeth, that there is a Difference in the Style in the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles, some of whom wrote more loftily and eloquently, others with less Elegancy and Loftiness, and sometimes there is the same Difference in different Writings. This Difference may not be attributed to the Holy Spirit, but to Men, and consequently 'tis they, not the Spirit, which are the Authors of the Words and Expressions which they use, although he inspires them with the Sense and Doctrine they ought to write.

In his Answer to the third Objection, he opposeth the Opinion of his Adversary, who maintain'd, that the Souls of Men were created, separated from the Bodies; he affirms, that we ought to believe, that they are created in and with the Body, although the Philosophers delivered the contrary, and *Austine* doubts of it.

In the next Place he answers a Question put to him by his Adversary, whether Truth be any Thing but God. He answers, That Truth is not always taken for God himself, although 'tis not to be doubted, but that God is Truth. The fourth Question concerns the righteous Men of the Old Law. *Agobard* maintains that they may be called Christians, although they were not called so, because they believed in Jesus Christ, and belonged to him, being anointed with the invisible Ointment of his Grace, as well as those who were good Men among the Gentiles.

The Jews who were in Credit at Court, because they had Money, obtained an Edict from the Emperor, which contained many Things in their Favour, and among the rest, that none of their Slaves should be baptized, but with their Masters Consent. This Edict being very prejudicial to Religion, and contrary to Christian Piety, *Agobard* addressed a Writing to *Hilduin* the King's great Chaplain, and to the Abbot *Vala*, who was at Court, in which he shews the Injustice and Impiety of that Prohibition, being evidently contrary to the Design of the Gospel, and the Intention of Jesus Christ, who will have all Men to be saved, and hath commanded his Apostles to preach the Gospel to all Creatures, and baptize all that believe, whether Bond or Free. He desires them to whom he writes, to endeavour all they can to get this Edict recall'd, which he hoped might be done more easily, because he offered to pay the Jews the Ransom of those Slaves, according to the Appointment of the Canons made in that Case.

In the Letter written by *Agobard* in his own Name, and *Hildegisus* and *Florus's*, who were Clergymen of *Lyon*, to

Of the
Constitutions
and
Canons
concerning
the Disci-
pline of the
Church.

Bartholomew Bishop of *Narbonne*, he speaks of a certain Distemper, which took Men suddenly, and threw them down like the Falling-Sickness. Some also felt a sudden Burning, which left an incurable Wound. This ordinarily happen'd in Churches, and the astonish'd People to guard themselves from it, gave considerable Gifts to the Churches to secure them. *Agobard* disallows this Practice, and searching into the Cause of this Plague, he says, 'twas Nothing else but the Will of God, who punisheth Men by the Ministry of an Angel. After which, he relates several Examples of the like Chastisements out of Scripture, in which God hath exercised his Justice by Angels and other Creatures. He affirms, That these Sort of Inflictions are not from the Power of the Devil, although he owns that God sometimes suffers the Devil to disquiet and torment Men. Returning then to the Question of *Bartholomew*, viz. What we ought to think of the Practice of those, who coming into the Churches, where they were seized with this Distemper, bring Presents to them. He says, That Fear causes these People to do what they ought not, and hinders them from doing what they ought; for it were better, says he, to give Alms to the Poor, or Strangers, to address themselves to the Priest to receive Unction, according to the Command of the Gospel and of the Apostle, to fast and pray, and do Works of Charity. It is true, adds he, that if the Offerings given to the Church be employed as they ought, they are an Action of Charity, but because at present, they are used only to satisfy the Covetousness and Avarice of Men, and not to honour God, or relieve the Poor, it is a Shame to give them to such covetous Wretches to be kept, or ill employed by them.

The Injustice and Violence which were practised among the People of *Lyons*, and could not be restrained, obliged *Agobard* to write to *Matfridus*, a powerful Man in the Emperor's Court. He begs of him to use his Interest with his Prince, to hinder those Disorders, and cause Justice to be done. This Compliment is short, but urgent. The Letter to the Clergy of *Lyons* concerning the Manner how the Bishops and Pastors ought to govern, is an excellent Instruction for them. He says, That those who are entrusted with the Government of the Church, the Spouse of Christ, who is Peace, Truth, Justice, and the Author of all Good, ought to love that his Spouse singularly as himself, and apply himself entirely to the spiritual Good of his only Spouse. That those who neglect to do their Duty, and place all their Pleasures and Affections upon Riches, Finery, Hunting, and Debauchery, are the Destroyers of God's Work, and the Assistants of Antichrist; That though they seem to be Bishops in the Eyes of Men, they are not so in the Eyes of God, no more than Hypocrites, who affect to appear outwardly Holy, but whose Heart is full of Impurity, who seek not the Edification and Instruction of the Faithful, but their own Interest and Glory: Such are those, who seek to get into the sacred Ministry, only to obtain Honour and Riches, or to live finely. He adds, That all those, that make it their main Business to gain themselves the Love and Respect of those that are under their Charge, and not to make Jesus Christ be loved and honoured by them, who is the only Spouse of the Church, are Adulterers and unworthy of the sacred Ministry, because they design rather to feed themselves than their Flock. Nevertheless he advises, that the Sheep should endure wicked Pastors, through Prudence, when they can't reform them.

His Book concerning the Dispensing of Ecclesiastical Revenues, was not written against the ill Usage, which Clergymen might make of them, but against the Laity, who took them away and kept them unjustly. *Lewis the Godly*, having called an Assembly of Clergymen and Lords at *Arras*, in 822. for the Reformation of Church and State, *Agobard* advises *Adelardus* Abbot of *Corby*, and another Abbot called *Helisicarius*, that they ought to rectify the Disorder, that was in the Church about the Ecclesiastical Revenues, which the Laity had appropriated to themselves, that they might speak to the Emperor of it. He zealously represents to them, that the Churches having been enriched by the Gifts of the Emperors, Princes and Bishops, had made an Abundance of Laws and Canons for the Preservation of the Revenues, and to hinder Laymen from encroaching upon them; That the Necessity which they alledged, was not a sufficient Reason to over-look those Laws, nor to authorize the Usurpations they had made of them. The Year following, this Matter was more fully debated in an Assembly held at *Compeigne*, where the Clergy again represented that the Laity were not to be suffered in the quiet Possession of the Revenues of the Church, which they had usurped. The Lords would not agree to the Restitution of them. The Emperor thought to accommodate the Matter between the Bishops and Nobles, by causing a Part to be restored only, but the Nobles not contented with it, declared at length, that they would not hear of any Accommodation, and complained grievously against *Agobard*, as a Man who had raised a Question, which was fit to trouble both Church and State. In this Book he defends himself by bringing Authorities out of the Old

and New Testament, to shew, that it is a great Crime to meddle with the Goods consecrated to the Temple, Altars, Maintenance of Ministers, and Relief of the Poor. To them he joyns the Authority of the Canons, and chiefly those of the *French Church*. He observes, That some would not receive them, because the Popes and Emperors Deputies were not present at the Councils that made them, but 'tis his Judgment, that wherever *Orthodox* Bishops are met in the Name of Jesus Christ for the Good of the Church, the Decisions they make ought to be respected and followed, which, says he, is established upon the Authority of the Popes, who have ordained that every two Years, two Councils shall be held in every Province, and have commended great Councils. Lastly, *Agobard* not only condemns the Laymen, who make Use of the Revenues of the Church to maintain Dogs and Horses, and great Retinues of Servants; or to satisfy their Pleasures and Passions, or spend them in Sports and superfluous Gallantry, but he involves in the same Condemnation the Bishops, Abbots and Clergymen, who put those Revenues to any other Use, than is allowed by the Laws of the Church and Doctrine of the Fathers.

Agobard's Treatise against the Judgment of God (i. e. the Proofs made of Mens Innocency, either by single Combate, or by holding a red-hot-Iron, or by standing immoveable by a Cross, or by any other Proof of like Nature) contains several Maxims taken out of the Holy Scripture, and chiefly out of the New Testament; by which he proves, that this Usage is contrary to the Gospel, Christian Charity, Right Reason, and the Principles of our Religion.

In his Discourse of the Faith, *Agobard* runs through the chief Articles of our Belief, as the Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption; the Union of Jesus Christ with his Church; the Necessity of the Grace of Jesus Christ to do Good, and resist Temptations; Patience in Adversity; Obligation to Prayer, &c. and sets down on every Point Texts of Scripture, or Fathers: 'Tis rather a Sermon, than a Doctrinal Treatise.

The Letter of Lamentation about the Division of *Europe*, dedicated to *Lewis the Godly*, was written by *Agobard* in 833. when that Emperor made War against his Children. *Agobard*, who wished for Peace, although he was of *Lotharius's* Party, sent this Letter to him. He first of all represents to him, that it is the Duty of a faithful Subject, and chiefly of a Prelate, to admonish his Prince, when he sees him ready to engage in a bad Cause, where his Soul is endangered. He calls God to witness, that this was the only Cause of his writing to *Lewis the Godly*. Lastly, after he hath lamented the Calamities and Disorders which the War had caused, he tells him, that he did some Time since part his Country between his Children, and made *Lotharius* a Partner in the Empire: That it was done with all the Solemnity possible, and with the Consent of the Nobles and Bishops; That to consult the Will of God about it, he had commanded a Fast, continual Prayers, and Alms for three Days; That the Thing being finished, he sent the Act to *Rome*, to have it confirmed by the Pope. Lastly, that he he obliged them all to swear, that they approved the Election of *Lotharius*, and Division of the Empire. That, at first, all Letters and Edicts bore the Name of the two Emperors in the Front of them; but afterward he put out the Name of *Lotharius* without any Reason, and attempted to dispossess him of it. He beseeches *Lewis the Godly* not to persist in that Design. He lets him know, that the Oath he had taken obliged him to be of *Lotharius's* Party; and he endeavours to terrify that Prince, who was of a fearful Spirit, by threatening the Judgments of God, and Hatred of Men upon him.

About the same Time he sent a Treatise to *Lotharius*, intitled *A Comparison between the Ecclesiastical and Civil Government*; in Answer to an Order, which the Emperor had given to the Nobles, as well of the Clergy as Laity, to be ready to fight for him; the one with the Sword, and the other with the Tongue. *Agobard* tells him, that he ought in War to put his Trust in God's Help, more than his own Forces; and that in all Disputes we should seek the Truth, rather than Eloquence. Since he was one of those that *Lotharius* had commanded, not daring to come himself, he admonished him by Writing, of the Respect he ought to give the Holy See; and, to persuade him to it, he cites a Passage of Pope *Pelagius*, against some Bishops, who would not recite the Pope's Name at Mass: And another Passage out of *St. Leo*, about the Primacy of *Peter*. *Agobard* touched upon this String, because *Lotharius* carried Pope *Gregory IV.* along with him, to authorize his own Party, and make his Father's odious. He knew what the other Bishops of *France* said, that if he came to excommunicate them, he should return excommunicated himself. *Si excommunicatus veniret, excommunicatus abiret.* *Agobardus* owned, That if *Gregory* came, with an ill Design, to foment War, he deserved to be sent away with Disgrace: But he maintains, that if he came to procure the Peace and Quiet of the Empire, they ought to obey him, and not resist him. Now, he affirms, that this is the End of his Voyage, since he

he came to settle what was done by the Will of *Lewis*, and the Consent of all the Members of the Empire; and confirmed by the Authority of the Holy See. He adds, That he had received Letters from him, commanding, that Prayers and Fasting be made for the Restoration of the Peace, and Agreement of the Empire, and in the Emperor's Family. Lastly, *Agobard* exhorts *Lewis the Godly* to be of that Mind.

This Writing is followed by a Letter, or rather a Fragment of a Letter of *Gregory* the Fourth to the Bishops of *France*, who would not receive him. It serves for an Answer to the Letter which they wrote to him. In the Beginning of it he finds Fault, that they had called him Father; and Pope, in the Superscription of their Letter. He requires them to give him only the Name of Father, as if the Bishops were not his Brethren, and had not that Title given upon many Occasions; yea, in those very Letters he sent to them. The second Thing that *Gregory* finds Fault with in the *French* Bishops Letter, is, that they declare their Joy for his Arrival; being persuaded, that it would be profitable for their Prince and his Subjects; and that they would have paid their Respects to him, had they not been prevented by an Express Order from the Emperor. He complains, That they preferred the Order of their Prince, before their Respect due to him; and maintains, that the Matter of Fact was not true, for they had Notice of his Arrival, before they had any such Command from the Emperor. He adds, That they ought to know, that the Spiritual Government of Souls is more excellent, than the Temporal Government of Princes, as *St. Gregory Nazianzen* boldly told the same Emperor: That they ought to imitate the Liberty of *Gregory the Great*, who told the Emperor, that he was one of his Sheep, and that he ought to hear and believe him in Things that belong to the Faith. That, instead of those foolish Flatteries which they used to ingratiate themselves with the Prince, they ought to consider *St. Augustine's* Words, in *Chap. 24. l. 5. of his Civitate Dei*; where he gives Christian Princes excellent Advice. All this is very good, but it hinders not, but that though Bishops have received an Order from their Prince not to go to the Pope, yet they ought to do their Duty; for that Prohibition is concerning a Thing purely Civil and Politick, in which they are obliged to obey him, when it is not contrary to the Essential Duties of Religion.

In the third Place, Pope *Gregory* complains, that the Bishops of *France*, after they had declared their Joy for the News of his Arrival in *France*, say, That they were much troubled when they heard that he came to pronounce a presumptuous Excommunication, without any Reason, to the Dishonour of the Imperial Power, and Contempt of the Episcopal Authority. He reproves their Inconstancy, and asks them, whether the Actions committed by the Emperor; which are really worthy of Excommunication, be not a greater Disgrace to his Imperial Majesty, than Excommunication if inflicted would be. But it doth not appear that he had good Grounds for his Reproof or Question. Only those are justly charged with Inconstancy, who change without Reason; and, in the same Posture of Affairs: For that which made the Bishops of *France* alter their Mind, was, the News they had heard, that *Gregory* would excommunicate their Prince. They rejoiced at his Arrival, because they believed he came to settle Peace; but when they saw he came to increase their Trouble, by an unjust Excommunication, they were the more disturbed; because they foresaw, that it would tend to his Disgrace both before God and Man, to take the Part of Rebellious Children against their Father. And, for this Reason 'tis, that *Gregory* had no good Grounds for this Question. Whether the Emperor did not dishonour himself more, by doing Things worthy of Excommunication, than he could do by Excommunicating him; for although perhaps it may happen, that such an Extremity may be used against a King of *France*, yet *Lewis the Godly* deserved not Excommunication. He was a Prince of great Piety and Religion in *Agobard's* Opinion; he had done Nothing against the Law of God, or the Church: The Controversie he was engaged in, was about the Division of his Empire, which did not at all belong to the Vicar of Jesus Christ to take Cognizance of; since the Chief Pastor himself would not meddle with such Matters, while he was upon Earth; and if it had been allowed him to intermeddle with such Affairs, he ought to have endeavour'd to make Peace, and re-unite the Father and Children, and not increase the Division by a rash Excommunication; he ought not to have favoured a Rebellion of the Children against the Father, nor their Intrigues and Devices to dethrone him, as unjust, and ill an Action as a Man can be guilty of. In the fourth Place, this Pope blames that Distinction between the Holy See and his Person; and that they might bear a due Respect to that, though they condemned his Actions. He says, they ought to respect the Person for the See's sake. This is true; but that Respect ought not to proceed so far, as to approve Things, which he doth, contrary to the Honour of his See, and Spirit of Jesus Christ and his Church: They respected his See, and his Person for its sake; but they condemned and disap-

proved the Personal Faults which he committed, and the Errors he was fallen into.

The Bishops of *France*, in Justification of themselves, had written, that they could not break the Oath they had taken to the Emperor without Sin, nor deny him their Allegiance. *Gregory* affirms, that it was he that was faithful to him, because he reprov'd his Actions against Religion and the Church; but, as for them, they denied him the Faith they ow'd him, by suffering his Disorders. If the Quarrel had been about Religion, or the Manners of that Prince, 'tis true, the Bishops had been defective in their Duty, if they had not admonish'd him of it; but, when the whole Contest was about the Division of the Empire, it did not belong either to the Bishops or Pope to meddle with it. They had taken an Oath to *Lewis the Godly* (which the Pope did not deny) and they ought to obey him: They also ow'd the same to his Children, but after their Father, whose Interests ought to be preferred before those of his Children. If the Pope had come with this Intention, the Bishops of *France* would have received him honourably, as they told him in their Epistle. This Expression offended him farther. He told them, that they acted by Humane Motives, and to get a Reward in this World. None but God knew their Intention; but, their Action was accounted by Men as an Effect of their true Christian Generosity and Fidelity. At last, the Pope comes to the Matter of the Quarrel, which was about the Parting of the Empire. The Bishops of *France* held, that the Division made in 817. might be altered for the Good of the State. The Pope maintained, that this Change was so far from being advantageous to the State, that it caused infinite Troubles to it, and so could not be said to be according to God's Will. The Bishops of *France* invited him to come to the Emperor, that he might know the Truth of the Thing. *Gregory* rejected that Proposition with Disdain, believing it evident, that the Change was unjust, because it was the Cause of so great Troubles; as if God did not sometimes permit just Attempts to meet with unfortunate Events. And besides, it was not the Alteration which was made in parting the Empire, which disturbed the State; but the Division it self, which *Lewis the Godly* had made among his Children; for, from that Time, there was no Union among them, and they sought all Ways to prejudice one another, and dispossess their Father, by raising, daily, Wars destructive to the State.

The Bishops of *France* added, That if the Pope came with Intentions, contrary to what they hoped, they would not endure him to dispose of any Thing in their Dioceses, or excommunicate any Man. *Gregory* wonders, that they would hinder him from settling Peace in their Churches; That indeed they might separate themselves from the Unity of the Church, but could not separate the Churches of Jesus Christ from the See Apostolick; as if that were to separate themselves from the Holy See, to make the ancient Canons to be observed, which forbid all Bishops, as well those of the Apostolick Sees as others, to do any Thing in the Dioceses of their Brethren, without their Permission. Lastly, the Bishops of *France* tell him in their Letter, That they thought themselves obliged to declare to him, what they could much rather have kept to themselves, that if he would not follow their Counsel, he would be in Danger of losing his Dignity. The Pope denies not but if he were guilty of some great Crime, as Murther, Sacrilege, or Theft, he might be degraded: But, he says, Nothing is more ridiculous, than to threaten him with that Punishment, because he would not agree to their Judgment. The Bishops of *France* labour'd to insinuate, that he deserved to be deposed for Perjury, of which they affirm he was guilty; in taking Part against *Lewis the Godly*, to whom he had taken an Oath of Allegiance, as is evident from the Sequel of the Letter; which put *Gregory* into so great a Passion. He says, That if he were perjured, he could not be depos'd by those, who were equally guilty of that Sin, but they could not prove him so. They added, That as to the Bishops, that followed *Gregory's* Party, they should be judged with the greatest Severity, *irretractabiliter*. The Pope accuses them of Presumption, to believe, that their Judgment might not be examined a-new, in a General Council, *apud Universitatem*; or by more Judicious Persons, who have more equal Intentions; Or, Lastly, at the Tribunal of Jesus Christ. But 'tis evident, that the Bishops of *France* spoke only of Humane Judgments, which were according to the Ancient Discipline established by the Council of *Nice*, strongly defended in *Africa*, and maintained in *France*; according to which, the Judgment given by the Bishops of a Country against the Clergy, or Bishops of it, is of unalterable Force, and cannot receive any Change. For this Reason the Bishops of *France* did so vigorously maintain the Rights and Liberties of their Churches; and discharged their Duty of Fidelity and Obedience to their King, according to their Oath, without denying a due Respect to the Holy Apostolick See.

Although the Cause of *Lewis the Godly's* Children was very heinous, yet *Agobard* endeavours to make it plausible in his *Manifesto* [or *Apology* for them.] The Pretence of their

their Rebellion was, the Good of the State : Their Design, if we may believe them, was to purge the Court of Plots, and Debaucheries, and settle Union and firm Correspondence between their Father and themselves ; and chiefly to repress the Publick Disorders of their Mother-in-Law, whom they had once imprisoned ; but, being after released, was always possessing their Father's Mind against them, and creating Disturbances. They declare, That *Lewis the Godly* caused an Oath first to be made to himself, then to his Son

Lotharius, and after that to *Pepin*, and, last of all, had compelled almost all the World to promise Fidelity to a Babe ; (i. e. to *Charles the Bald*, the Son of his second Wife, to whom he gave *Austria*, after he had taken it from *Pepin*.) That he had raised Troops, which ought rather to be employ'd against the *Barbarians* ; That he did all this by the Advice of some Men, who justled for the Destruction of his Children, that they might more easily compass his own ; That the Queen did many indecent Things in the Sight of all the World, yea, and of the Bishops themselves. He adds, That 'tis for the Publick Interest to labour for the Peace and Quiet of the State ; That to do this effectually, they ought to have Recourse to the Original of these Grievances, which is no other Thing but the Irregularities, Debaucheries and Ambition of the Queen ; who, like another *Jezabel*, or *Dalila*, having entirely engrossed the Affections of the King, did make him do much Injustice and Wrong, for which he ought to put himself into a State of Penance, and leave his Throne to his Son. These last Words shew, that this Book was made some Time after *Lewis the Godly* was deposed, and put to Penance, in 833. as it is related in the *Memoir*, according to *Agobard* ; where he says, That he was present at the Assembly of Bishops and Lords, held in the Royal Palace of *Compeigne*, in the 4th. Month, 833. to consider the Danger the Kingdom was in, by Reason of the Negligence, Cowardice, and Irregularities of the Emperor *Lewis* ; and that he approved all that was done for the Good of the State, and for the Amendment and Ease of *Lewis's* Soul, which made him admonish him of his Faults, by his Commissioners, and exhort him to Repentance ; and, for that End, he gave him a Schedule of his Crimes, that he might see the Foulness of his Actions ; That all the Bishops had met him, and compassionating his Weakness and Misfortunes, had begged of God to deliver him from his Misfortunes, and pardon his Sins ; that so his Soul being raised by the true Contrition of an humble Heart, and humbling himself before them, had acknowledged and confessed his Crimes several Times ; That he had begged Pardon, and undergone the Penance imposed on him ; That, lastly, going to the Church, in the Presence of the People, he had prostrated himself before the Altar and Tombs of the Saints ; and lying in Sackcloth, had confessed aloud, three or four Times, his Crimes, with Abundance of Tears ; and, pouring out his Tears at the Bottom of the Altar, he was put to Publick Penance, by the Imposition of the Hands of the Bishop, with Singing of Psalms and Prayer.

The Book dedicated to *Ebbo*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, contains a Collection of Texts of Scripture, about Hope and Fear, but we have Nothing remaining at present but only the Preface.

The Works of *Agobard* conclude with two Pieces of Poetry ; the one an Epitaph upon *Charles the Great* ; the other is some Verses upon the Translation of the Relicks of *St. Cyprian*, *St. Speratus*, and *Pantaleo*, brought out of *Africa* and *Arles* to *Lyons*.

Agobard writes in a plain Style, intelligible and natural, but something flat, and without Ornament : His Discourse is mingled with several Citations, long Passages of Scripture and Fathers, according to the Custom of his Time. He argues very rationally about the Matters he treats of, and writes like a Man well versed in the Doctrine of the Fathers, and Discipline of the Church.

His Works are published by *Papirius Massonius*, and printed at *Paris* in 1605. in Octavo, out of a MS. which he found by Chance in a Book-binder's Shop at *Lyons*, which he designed to use as Waste-paper ; and which his Brother, after his Death, put into the King's Library. But though *Massonius* was a very learned Man, yet he left many Faults in his Edition, which have been since corrected by *M. Baluzius*, in his Edition of *Agobard's* Works, printed by *Magnuet* at *Paris*, 1666. in two Vol. Octavo, revised by the same MS. with great Exactness, who hath added a Treatise of *Agobard's* to it, against the Book of Offices, made by *Amalarius*, taken out of a MS. which was communicated to him by *F. Chiffletius*. [This Edition is put into the last Edition of the *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 14. p. 234.]

Amulo. *Amulo*, *Arulo*, or *Amulus*, a Deacon of the Church of *Lyons*, under *Agobard*, succeeded him in 841. He was in great Reputation and Favour with *Charles the Bald*. He was President in a Council held at *Lyons*, 845.

We have already spoken of this Letter to *Gotteschalvus* about the Question of Predestination and Grace : But we must here give an Extract of another Letter written to *Theobaldus*, or *Theobaldus*, Bishop of *Langres* ; who consulted

him about some Abuses committed in the Church of *St. Benignus* at *Dijon*, as to the Relicks shewed then : Two Of the Monks had brought some Bones of a pretended Martyr, *Confrat*, which they said came from *Rome*, and some other Place of *Italy* ; but that which was most pleasant, was, that these impudent Monks were not ashamed to say, That they had forgotten the Name of the Saint : As if, says *Amulo*, it were credible, that they could be ignorant of the Name of a Saint, famous in the Place from whence they had him ; or could forget his Name in the Way, whom they looked upon as their Patron, and whom they ought continually to pray to. The Bishop of *Langres* used much Prudence upon this Occasion ; and imitating *St. Martin* in a like Case, determined, That they ought not to receive those Relicks, which were not well attested ; but yet they might not use them with Contempt. Then he thought it fit to oblige those who had brought them, to procure authentick Proofs from the Place where they had them. Indeed, one of them went away with a Pretence to get some Proofs, but never returned ; and the other died a little Time after at *Dijon*. Nevertheless they laid up these pretended Relicks in the Church, by the Body of the Holy Martyr, and affirmed they did many Miracles : No sick Persons were cured by them ; but, on the Contrary, some Women fell upon the Ground, beat themselves, and made a Show as if they were plagued by them. This brought many to that Place. *Amulo* observes, that there were many Persons who were seized with the same Distemper, and, upon that Account, were obliged to stay in the Church, or to return again as soon as they were gone out of it : That this Distemper happened in other Places, particularly in the Village of *Saulieu*, in the Diocese of *Autun*, where the Bodies of the Holy Martyrs, *Andochius*, *Thyrsius*, and *Felix* lay.

Amulo hereupon advises the Bishop of *Langres* to remove these Bones out of the Church, and bury them in some decent Place at a Distance from it, in the Presence of some few Persons ; for, says he, since 'tis said, They are the Bones of some Saint, we ought not to deprive them of all Respect ; but yet we ought not to give an Occasion to the People to fall into an Error and Superstition. Nor may we fear, adds he, lest our Scrupulousness be the Cause of Scandal ; since God hath commanded us to be sincere, and prudent in Things which concern his Service. Whereupon he alledges the Example of *St. Martin*, and the Decree of Pope *Gelasius*. He says, That if there were any miraculous Cures done in the Church of *St. Benignus*, they ought to be attributed to God, and the Merits of his Saints, without approving other Signs, done in the Church or elsewhere. That it is likely, that the Fallings and Beatings of Men and Women, were the Effect of the Wickedness of those miserable Beggars, who pretended themselves to be so afflicted, only to get Money. That he never heard any such Miracles spoken of, as to make sound Men sick ; part Daughters from their Parents, and Women from their Husbands, by obliging them to continue in the Church, and hindring their Return to their Houses. That these Things are the Effect, either of Humane Malice, or Diabolical Illusions. Upon this Occasion he relates two Examples of Things of like Nature, which happen'd under his Predecessor *Agobard*, of which he found out the Cheat. He advises the Bishop of *Langres* to banish that Superstition out of his Diocese, to dissuade the People from it ; and exhort them earnestly not to assemble so unprofitably in that Place, but every one to remain in his Parish, and frequent the Service of that Church, where he received his Baptism, as well as the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, where he useth to hear Solemn Masses, from whose Priest they receive Penance, are assisted in their Sickness, and are buried after their Death ; to whom they pay their Tythes, and bring their Offerings, to which they go to hear saving Instructions. That in these Churches it is, they must meet to pay their Vows and Prayers to God, to beg the Prayers of the Saints, to give Alms to the poor Widows and Orphans : That this is the lawful and regular Discipline of the Church, and the ancient Practice of the Faithful. That if it happens that Christians fall into any Weakness or Sickness, they ought to follow the Command of *St. James*, to call the Priests to pray over them, and anoint them with Oil in the Name of the Lord. He doubts not but if this were put in Practice, all these pretended Miracles would cease : And he likewise advises him, that if any of these Wretches prove obstinate, to have them scourged, till they shall confess the Truth. He adds, That since these Distempers happened, through the Illusion of the Devil, they would do better to implore the Help of the Lord of their Churches, than to remain in a distant Church ; and that one Saint will not contradict the Honour given to another, because they are all united in the same Love. If they will go to visit the Churches of the Martyrs, they ought to do it at those Times, which are appointed for it by the Church, viz. In the *Rogations*, *Lent*, and Festivals of the Martyrs. Nevertheless he doth not condemn those who do it at other Times out of Devotion, provided they do it without Ostentation and Tumult ; but he finds Fault with them

them for neglecting to do it upon the solemn Days set apart by the Church; and tells them, they do it at other Times to no Purpose, through Vanity and Ostentation. Lastly, Since there are some People really possessed, they ought to be used by the Priests of the Place, or neighbouring Chapels of the Martyrs, in Private, with Gentleness, and not be exposed to the Throng and Tumult of the People. These are the principal Arguments of *Amulo* in this Letter, which prove, that this Bishop had much Sincerity, Knowledge, Prudence, Zeal, and Eloquence. He is also the Genuine Author of a Treatise against the *Jews*, published by Father *Chiffletius*, under the Name of *Rabanus* [at *Dijon*, 1656.] for *Trithemius* [*De Script. Eccles.*] attributes it to *Amulo*, and it is found under his Name in a MS. in the Library of M. *Colbert*. [*Baluzius* published the rest at the End of *Agouard's Works*.]

Adalardus, the Son of Count *Bernard*, Brother of *Pepin*, Grandson of *Charles Martellus*, great Master of the *French*, and Abbot of *Corbey*, was sent to *Rome* to Pope *Leo*, about the Question concerning the Procession of the Holy Ghost. Having joyn'd with *Bernard King of Italy*, in the Conspiracy against *Lewis the Godly*, he was forced to fly into *Aquitain*, to the Monastery of *St. Philibert*, but he was recalled in 822. and restored to his Monastery. He made some Statutes for the Church of *Corbey*, published by Father *Dacherius*, Tom. 4. of his *Spicilegium*. He died in 826. His Life is written by *Paschasius Rathbertus*, Abbot of *Corbey*.

Ansegisus, Abbot of *St. Wandrillus*, is the Author of the Collection of the Constitutions of *Charles the Great*, and *Lewis the Godly*, of which we have already spoken. He died in 834.

Hildegarius succeeded *Hildegaldus* in the Bishoprick of *Cambray*, in 816. He was sent with *Ebbo of Rheims* to preach the Gospel in *Denmark*; and, by *Lewis the Godly*, Ambassador to *Michael Balbus*, the Emperor of *Greece*, Anno 828. Being returned from that Embassy, he died in 830. June 25. He composed a Work intitled, *Of Vices, and their Remedies: Of Virtues, and the Order and Judgments of Penance*. 'Tis a long Penitential, divided into six Books, which is found in Tom. 5. of the Collection of *Canisius*, and in the *Biblioth. Patrum* [Tom. 14.] This Work is also attributed to *Rabanus*.

Isaac, surnamed the Good, a Scholar of *Hilduin*, and Deacon of *Pardulus*, Bishop of *Laon*, who was preferred to the Bishoprick of *Langres*, and present at the Council of *Savonieres* in 859. and the following Councils; made a Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws, taken out of the Canons of the Councils, held by *Boniface* Archbishop of *Mentz*, and confirmed by Pope *Zachary*; and out of the Constitutions of the *French Kings*; chiefly out of the three Books, which the Deacon *Benedict* hath added to the Collection of *Ansegisus*. This Collection is published by Father *Sirmondus*, in the ninth Tome of the Councils of *France*; and by M. *Baluzius*, Tome 1. of the *Capitularies*. Father *Dacherius* hath published a small Tract about the Canon of the *Mass*, which bears *Isaac's* Name. But M. *Baluzius* tells us, That 'tis not *Isaac* Bishop of *Langres's*, but another *Isaac's*, who was Abbot of *Stella*, whose Name it bears in some MSS. and under whose Name it hath been published in Tom. 6. of the *Biblioth. Cisterciensis*.

Herard, made Archbishop of *Tours* in 855. made a Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws in 856. taken out of the *Capitularies*, which he propounded to a Synod of Priests, held in *May* the same Year. This Collection is in Tom. 8. of the Councils of the last Edition, and at the End of Tom. 1. of M. *Baluzius's* *Capitularies*. This Archbishop died in 871.

Wauterius, or *Gauterius*, Bishop of *Orleans*, about the Year 870. made also a like Collection of Canons for his Diocese, which is printed Tom. 8. of the Councils.

Wulfadus having been ordained, as we have said, by *Ebbo*, and molested by *Hincmarus*, was made Archbishop of *Bourges*, in 866. He hath left a Pastoral Letter, directed to the Priests of his Diocese, which Father *Mabilion* hath put out in Tom. 4. *Analect.* This Bishop died in 876.

Ricalphus, who was Bishop of *Soissons*, about the End of the ninth Age, sent, in 889. a Pastoral Letter to the Curates of his Diocese, containing 28 very useful Constitutions for ordering their Discipline and Manners. He exhorts them to labour after the Sanctity of their People, by their good Example and Knowledge: He advises them to be constant in Divine Service, and exhort their Parishioners to be there as often as they can; but to be sure not to be absent on Festivals and Sundays. He requires them to say by heart the *Psalms*, Canon of the *Mass*, Creed, *Quicumque*, &c. That they should be skilled also in Singing, and the Calendar; That they should have Rituals to administer Baptism, a Missal, a Book of the Lessons, a Book of the Gospels, a Martyr-Book, a Book of Anthems, a Psalter, and a Copy of *St. Gregory's* forty Homilies. He also prescribes what Ornaments they ought to have, and orders them to take Care of them, to keep them neat, as well as the Holy Places. He orders them to instruct the Catechumens in *Lent*, that they may be baptized, and receive the Eucharist at *Easter*.

He commands them to have a Care of the Publick Penitents, and not to receive them to Absolution, till they have performed the Time of their Penance; and if it happens that they are forced to it by Necessity, or any other Reason, he desires them to have particular Care of them. He orders them to administer to the Sick the Holy Unction, after Confession, and Absolution, but before Communion. He allows them to give Absolution to the Sick, that have lost their Speech, if there be any that can witness that they desired it. He puts them in mind of the Division of the Churches Revenues into four Parts, and requires an Account of that, which is to be employ'd for the Service of the Church. He exhorts them to have two or three Clergymen to celebrate Masses, i. e. Divine Service with him; and forbids them to celebrate it alone. He advises them to be charitable and hospitable. He forbids them going to Inns, suffer Wine to be sold in the Church, to dwell with any Women, or be familiar with them; to be Farmers, or Men of Business. He forbids Usury, and orders them to keep the Sunday Holy. He requires them to take Nothing for the Burial of the Dead, but allows them to take any Free-gifts. He orders the Deans to call Assemblies of the Curates every Month, on the first Day of it, but forbids Feasting at them; and enjoins them to have Conferences about what concerns their Ministry, and the Occasions of their Parishes. He orders them to reconcile those that are Enemies, or excommunicate them if they refuse. He enjoins them to give Notice of the Fasts, he hath appointed, to the People. This Letter is published by *Condesius*, with *Hincmarus's* Works [at *Paris*, 1615.] and is printed in Tom. 9. of the Councils.

Elias, Bishop of *Jerusalem*, wrote in 887. a Letter to *Charles the Gross*, the Clergy, and Lords of the Kingdom of *France*, to desire of him some Relief for the Churches of his Country; He tells him, That the Prince under whose Government they were, being become a Christian, had allowed them to rebuild, and repair their Churches, which were either quite ruin'd, or ready to fall; That to do it, they were forc'd to mortgage their Lands and Revenues, so that they had Nothing to purchase Oil, Ornaments, and holy Vessels for Divine Service: Then he exhorts this Prince, and the *French*, to exercise their Charity upon this Occasion, and to bestow something upon the two Monks which he would send to gather their Alms. This Letter is in *Latin* in Tom. 2. of *Dacherius's Spicilegium*. It is well written, but very short.

Luitbertus, Archbishop of *Mentz*, hath written a Letter to King *Lewis*; In which he tells that Prince, That seeing the Danger their Churches were expos'd to, he was obliged to speak, because the Primacy and Dignity of *St. Peter* is assaulted and dishonoured by those who ought to be the Leaders of the People of God; who prefer Humane Things before Divine; inasmuch, that he is afraid, that the Evil, which is in the Head, will spread it self into all the Members, unless a Remedy be timely provided. He tells the King, that there is present Danger, because those that ought to watch for the Salvation of others, destroy themselves, and dig a Pit of Destruction for those that follow them. He exhorts him to confer with those, that know the Law of God, that he may remove these Scandals, and settle Peace in the Church. He adds, That it is so much the easier, because all the Body of the Church is not corrupted as yet; That there are some Members weakened by the Wound in the Head, but may be cured with suitable Medicines; That it seems necessary and profitable, that King *Charles* call a Council soon; that the Bishops of his Kingdom, which are not infected with the Disease, might joyn with the Bishops of *Germany* and him, to restore the Peace and Agreement of the Catholick Church, as soon as he returns from the Voyage he was about to take. This Letter seems to relate to the Troubles, which happened after the Death of *Lotharius*, about the Kingdom of *Lorraine*, which Pope *Adrian* claimed for the Emperor *Lewis*; threatening Excommunication to *Charles*, and to the rest who were in Possession of it.

Of all Authors of this Age, there is none that hath taken more Pains about the Canons than *Regino*. He was chosen Abbot of *Prom*, about 892. after *Farabertus* had voluntarily resigned it, but he enjoy'd it not long, being deprived of it in 899. by the Arts of his Enemies, who put *Richarius*, the Brother of the Counts *Gerhardus* and *Montfredus*, into his Place. He endured this Injustice, with a great deal of Patience, and lived a Private Monk, in the Abby of *Prom*. In this Time he composed his Collection of Canons, and Ecclesiastical Constitutions at the Desire of *Rathboldus*, Archbishop of *Treves*. He finished it in 906. He also composed a Chronicon, which ends in 908. dedicated to *Adelbertus* Bishop of *Metz*. We do not exactly know to what Age he lived.

His Collection of Canons is intitled, *A Treatise of Ecclesiastical Discipline and of the Christian Religion, collected by the Order of Rathboldus, Archbishop of Treves, by Regino, heretofore Abbot of Prom, and taken out of the Fathers, Councils*

Councils and Popes. It is divided into two Books. In the first he sets down the Canons, which concern Ecclesiastical Persons; and in the second, those that concern the Laity. These two Books begin each of them, with a Form of such Things, as Bishops or Ministers ought to be informed in, when they make their Visits. That which is at the Beginning of the first, concerns the Clergy; and that which is at the Beginning of the second, concerns the Laity. Then he confirms the Articles of the first by the Canons and Ecclesiastical Constitutions. He quotes the Canons of the Councils, and particularly those of *France*, the Constitutions of the Kings, the genuine Decretals of the Popes, and sometimes the false; some Passages of the Fathers and Ecclesiastical Authors. This Collection is very large, and exact. *Burchardus*, *Ivo Carnotensis*, and the other Collectors of Canons that follow him, have made Use of it, and often copy it out. It hath been published from a MS. of *Flaccus Illyricus*, and printed at *Helmstadt*, 1659; and since M. *Baluzius* hath taken Care to print it at *Paris*, by *Muguet*, 1671. having received it by a very Ancient MS. in the Library of the Fathers of the Oratory at *Paris*. He hath set down in the Margin, the Places from which the Canons and Passages of that Collection are taken, and where the Articles of *Burchardus's* Collection are found.

Regius's Chronicon is divided into two Books. It was printed at *Frankfort* in 1583. *Trithemius* assures us, that this Author wrote several Sermons, some Letters, and other Works, which never came to his Hands. He much commends his Ingenuity, Learning and Piety; and says, that he is the best of the *German* Writers of his Time.

Lastly, we have another Author of this Age, who treats of a very curious Subject of Discipline, and that is *Auxilius*, who maintains the Validity of the Ordinations made by Pope *Formosus*. He was (a) ordained by this Pope, and 'twas his Interest to defend it. He hath made two small Treatises upon that Subject, in which he shews a great deal of Learning for the Age he lived in.

The first is a Collection of Ecclesiastical Constitutions and Passages of Fathers, to prove that a Bishop deprived of his Bishoprick may be dignified in another Church, when it is for the Good and Advantage of the Church, and with the Pope's Permission. This Collection was designed to prove the Translation of *Formosus*, from the Bishoprick of *Osimo* to the *Roman* See, lawful. Then he adds some other Testimonies to shew, that though the Ordination of *Formosus* was not lawful, yet the Ordinations made by him were valid. Upon the first Head, he brings a Passage out of the false Decretal of *Anserus*, the Example and Authority of *St. Gregory Nazianzen*, the Examples of some Translations alledged by *Socrates*, and what is observed in the *Greek Book*, about the Translation of *St. German* of *Cyzeum* to *Constantinople*. Then he shews, That the Canons of the Council of *Nice*, do not forbid all Translations, but those only, that are made through Ambition, and to disturb the Church. He approves the Law, which *Hosius* propounded in the Council of *Sardica*, which forbids those Translations which are made for Avarice, Ambition, or Dominion; but he disapproves what is added, that those who pass from one See to another, shall be reduced to Lay Communion. He affirms this Law, comes near the Rigour of the *Novatians* condemned by *St. Austine*, that it was not approved by the Holy See; and that *Hosius* was of no great Authority, having fallen into Heresie. He ought to have observed, that all the Bishops of the Council approved the Opinion of *Hosius*.

Auxilius then passeth to the second Head; which concerns the Validity of the Ordinations made by *Photius*, and alledgeth the Testimonies of *St. Innocent*, *St. Austine*, *St. Leo*, *St. Gregory*, and *St. Anastasius*, to shew that the Ordinations made by unlawful Bishops are valid, and ought not to be repeated. He confirms this Doctrine by a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which accepted the Ordinations made by the *Novatians*. He says, That since the Ordinations of Pope *Liberius*, who was an Heretick, and *Vigilius* who was an Usurper, guilty of Simony and Murder, were well approved, there is much greater Reason to allow of those made by *Formosus*. He proves, That it will cast the Church of *Italy* into strange Confusion, and the Faithful into inexpressible Trouble. He observes, That if there was any Default in the Translation of *Formosus*, it did not belong to him, who accepted it, but to the Clergy and Nobles of *Rome*, who chose him, and acknowledged him for their Bishop. Lastly, he proves, That they who swear, that their Ordination is void, are guilty of Sacrilege, and they are not obliged thereby to obey the Commands of their Superiors, nor of the Pope who exacts it, because they

ought not to execute those Commands of Superiors, which are contrary to Justice, and the Law of God; That their Excommunication ought to be feared or observed, but when it is just; That we ought to distinguish between the Papal See, and the Persons who preside in it; That we ought to respect the Sees, but not follow those that preside in them, if they depart from the Faith or Religion, although they are obliged to obey them in those Things, they order well, although they would not do it. In Conclusion, He advises, "That this Collection of Testimonies may perhaps seem needless to several Persons, because there are few People, that will judge of their Affair with Equity, and that he did not hope to carry his Cause in the Judgment of those, who are both Judges, Advocates and Witnesses, but that according to the Opinion of *St. Jerome*, he wrote both for himself, and for them which were of his Judgment, that they might be courageous, seeing they do not ground their Belief upon their own Sense, but the Holy Fathers, and that they observe that which is written; That if a Multitude rise up against you, you should not fear, and that they should hold fast what they have received, lest you lose your Crown. That continuing in the sacred Vocation you have received, they may wait for the Impartial Examination of a General Council, under the Protection of which they may put themselves with those Words. Lift up thy Self O Lord, judge thine own Cause."

The second Treatise of *Auxilius*, saith *Sigibert*, in his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, is written in Form of a Dialogue, by way of Question and Answer. It was composed at the Desire of *Leo*, Bishop of *Nola*, who had been ordained by *Formosus*, who being urged to acknowledge, that the Priesthood which he had received from Pope *Formosus*, is null; first consulted the *French* Bishops, and the Bishop of *Beneventum* about it, who answered him, that he ought not to do it, and then sent his Request to *Auxilius*, to answer the Objections made against the Ordinations of *Formosus*. At the Beginning of this Treatise is propounded a general Question, which serves as a Preface to it, viz. Whether those who have been ordained against their own Consent, but afterwards yield to their Ordination, ought to be re-ordained. To which he answers, that as we do not re-baptize Infants, nor such as have been baptized by Force; no more ought we to re-ordain them who have been involuntarily ordained. This Preface is accompanied with a Letter of *Auxilius's* to *Leo* Bishop of *Nola*, in which he tells him, that he made this Treatise to satisfy him, and had set down the Objections under the Name of the Objecter, and answers under the Name of the Defender. That he ought not to expect in his Writings Syllogisms in Form, no Logical Subtleties, being the Scholar of a Fisher, i. e. *St. Peter*. That 'tis true, though he is in his Bark, he is in a Tempest, but he prayed the Lord of all to command the Winds and Seas, and make a Calm.

The first Objection made by the Objecter, is about the Translation of *Formosus*. He says, having left his Wife, i. e. Bishoprick, he hath taken away the Holy See from them, who ought to be ordained in it; so that he is a Reprobate and Hypocrite. The Defender says, That he did not trouble himself with what *Formosus* was, but he maintained that the Ordinations of *Formosus* made by him were valid and lawful. The Objecter insists and says, that *Formosus* not being Pope, all the Ordinations made by him are null. All that Chapter contains this Difficulty. The Defender maintains, that his Ordinations may be valid, since *St. Leo* acknowledgeth the Ordinations of false Bishops to be so; That *Anastasius* allowed *Acaius's*, and no Man ever doubted of *Liberius* and *Vigilius's*. The Objecter replies, That the Council of *Nice* declared their Ordinations void; and that Pope *Innocent* asserts, that an Hypocrite and Reprobate can't confer Ordination, because he hath none. The Defender replies, that this ought to be understood of some, and not all Hereticks, since he approved of those that *Bonifus* ordained. The Objecter insists upon his Principle, and demands how it can be, that the Ordinations of a Reprobate can be valid, since the Members can't exist without the Head; and to urge it the farther, he asks to whom *Formosus's* Crime ought to be imputed; if his Ordinations are of Force, the Defender says, it belongs to the Clergy and People of *Rome*, and not to a Clergyman, who being a Stranger, came far with a good Intention to receive Ordination from him, whom he saw settled on the Holy See. Then he proves by the Testimonies of *Anastasius* and *St. Austine*, that a Reprobate and an Hypocrite may administer Sacraments effectually, and consequently Ordinations. That Objecter urges the Example of *Constantine* the Anti-

(a) Ordained by this Pope. He says it plainly at the End of his first Treatise, in which having spoken of the Validity of the Ordinations of this Pope; He adds, That he continued in the Order which he had received by Consecration, waiting for the equitable Judgment of a General Council. In the thirty first Chapter of his second Treatise, His Adversary objects,

that he was a Stranger: and at first he don't deny it, but about the End he puts in a Doubt: saying, 'twas a Fiction of his Adversaries. He says also in the same Place, that he was ordained a Priest by *Formosus*. In the Chapter of the second Book, he says also, that he was ordained by *Formosus*, and was come to *Rome* from his own Country.

pope, whose Ordinations were declared null, and the Per-
 sons ordained by him re-ordained. The Defender con-
 demns this Action, and opposes the Authority of St. Leo,
 Anasias, &c. Then he proves by some Passages of the
 Popes and Fathers, that Re-ordinations are no less faulty,
 than Re-baptizations. The Objecter says, That if it were
 so, a great Number of Men are Condemnable, because the
 Number of them that believe *Formosus's* Ordination null,
 is very great. This Inconvenience doth not at all touch
 the Defender. He says, God regards not great or small
 Numbers, but Justice; That his Flock is small; That he
 never hath, nor will pardon a Multitude of Sinners, though
 never so great, which he clears by the Example of the De-
 luge; People of the *Jews*, and the small Number of those
 that remained Faithful under the Persecution of *Antiochus*;
 adding to these Examples of the Old Testament, that in
 St. *Athanasius's* Time almost all the World embrac'd *Aria-
 nism*, and there was but a very small Number of Persons
 that continued in the Catholick Faith, and did obtain the
 Crown. The Defender having asserted, that those who
 are ordained a second Time ought to be excluded for ever
 from the sacred Ministry. The Objecter propounds two
 Difficulties against the Propositions. The first, That they
 are not deprived of Christianity, who have been re-baptized.
 The second is, that Clergymen who have fallen into Idola-
 try, may do their Duty, and perform their Functions, and
 therefore 'tis probable, that the same Thing may be allowed
 to those who are re-ordained. The Defender answers to
 the first, that a Minister's Function is not like the Title of
 a Christian, that this is necessary, but that the other is not.
 To the second he says, that they have been deposed with-
 out all hopes of Restoration, who have voluntarily re-
 nounced the Faith, and no Mercy hath been shewed, but
 only to those who have done it through the Violence of
 Torments. The Obedience due to the Pope, and the Oath
 which he required, to acknowledge that the Ordinations of
Formosus are null, create new Difficulties. The Defender
 strongly maintains, that Superiors ought not to be obeyed,
 when that which they command is forbidden, and that the
 Oaths taken in such Cases oblige not. He takes himself
 not to be obliged to go to the Synod, which the Pope had
 appointed, and treats the Bishops, that were at it, as Wolves.
 He adds, That it is sometimes convenient to discover the
 Faults of Superiors, especially when they are prejudicial to
 the Church, and they can't be remedied any other Way;
 and in fine, insists upon the Fact that 'tis a Fault, which is
 published, and aggravated by those that defend it. He pro-
 ceeds yet farther: He says, that we ought not to fear or re-
 gard the Excommunication that is unjustly pronounced.
 He repeats what he had said in his first Treatise about the
 Distinction of Sees, and them that sit in them. He comes
 next to the Examination of the Affair of *Formosus*; and says,
 as he was deposed, so also he was absolved by the Pope; that
 the Oath which they made him take never to come to *Rome*,
 or to return to his Bishoprick, was a Cruelty and an un-
 heard of Violence; That he did it only by Constraint.
 He brings several Examples of Bishops condemned and de-
 posed, who have been restored again. He adds, That *For-
 mosus* having been restored by the Pope, his first Deposition
 could not be alledged as an Obstacle to his Promotion to
 the Popedom; That only God knows, whether it was
 through Ambition that he was raised to the Holy See, and
 so it belongs only to him to judge of it. That all the City of
Rome, and neighbouring Provinces did bear Witnesses of
 his Piety, except some who had the Boldness to blast his
 Reputation. He endeavours to justify his Translation by
 the Example of several others, of whom he makes a long
 List. He answers as he had done in the other Treatise to
 to the Law propounded in the Council of *Sardica*, approving

the first, and condemning the second Part. The Council
 of *Africa* was objected, which forbids him who doth the
 Office of a Clergyman in one Church, to pass to another.
 He replies, that it is only forbidden by that Canon, to re-
 ceive the Clergy of another Bishop. He explains the Ca-
 nons, which forbid Translations, of such as are through
 a kind of Ambitious Avarice or Dominion, and proves
 that they do not comprehend those which are made for the
 Necessity, and Profit of the Church. He adds, That it be-
 longs to the People of *Rome* to answer for the Necessity
 and Advantage there was in Translating of *Formosus* to the
 See. It was objected, that although *Formosus* might be ex-
 cused as to those Points, yet the Blow he had received by
 suffering himself to be re-ordained, was not to be covered.
 This Objection much puzzled *Auxilius*, and to answer it,
 he supposeth that the Priests and Bishops are not essentially
 distinct, and endeavours to prove it by the famous Passage
 of St. *Jerome*, from whence he concludes, that as a Priest
 is consecrated to make a Bishop, without any Intention of
 consecrating him a Priest anew, but only adding the Epis-
 copal Title: In like Manner *Formosus* by his second Ordi-
 nation, did not lose the Title of Bishop he had before, but
 only received the Addition of the Apostolick Dignity. This
 Sophistical Answer of *Auxilius*, did not excuse *Formosus*,
 if the Matter of Fact were true; but he maintains imme-
 diately, that it was very false, and that he was informed by
 those, that were present at the Instalment of *Formosus*, that
 he did not receive a new Ordination, but was conducted
 to the Holy Apostolick See, by singing of Prayers, and
 was installed with a Speech proper for that Occasion. He
 adds, That none but his Enemies, and others, that had a
 present Quarrel with him, said, that he was ordained a
 second Time, whose Testimony was not worthy of Credit.
 That to pass a true Judgment of this Matter, a general
 Council ought to be called, which might easily remove the
 Scandal, and settle Peace in the Church; That the Synod
 held at *Ravenna* had confirmed the Ordination of *Formosus*,
 for which indeed the Bishops were accused of Bribery, but
 very unjustly. He aggravates the Cruelty exercised by
 Pope *Stephen* against *Formosus*, whose Corpse he took up
 and brought it to a Council, where having stripp'd him of
 his Pontifical Habits, he caused a Lay-Garb to be put on
 him, and having cut off two Fingers of his Right-Hand,
 he caused him to be buried in the Church-Yard for Stran-
 gers, from whence he was after thrown into the *Tiber*.
Auxilius says, that they that exercised this Piece of Inhu-
 manity upon him, acted like Savage Beasts; That this their
 Action was contrary to Heathen Morality, which obliges
 us to spare the Dead; That although the Translation of
Formosus had been contrary to the Laws of the Church, it
 ought to have been tolerated with a Christian Compassion,
 and not aggravated with an unheard of Cruelty. That all
 that could have been done, had been to have called a Coun-
 cil to forbid the People of *Rome* making the like Elections
 for the future. *Auxilius* after this is reproved by his Ad-
 versary, for saying, that it did not belong to him, who was
 a Stranger, to find Fault with the Opinion they had in *Italy*,
 about the Ordination of *Formosus*, and takes an Occasion
 from hence to shew, that he hath Reason to defend the
 Cause of *Formosus*. Lastly, to invalidate the Oath, which
 was required to destroy the Ordination of *Formosus*, he
 proves, that those Oaths ought not to be kept, that oblige
 a Man to do Evil. This is the Sum of the two Treatises
 of *Auxilius*, which are written with a great deal of Bold-
 ness and Freedom. [The former of them is published by
Morinus at the End of his Work, *De S. S. Ordinationibus*,
 and from thence put into the *Biblioth. Patrum* Tom. XVII.
 p. 1. The other is printed by *F. Mabillon*, *Analect.* Tom.
 IV. p. 610]

C H A P. XIII.

Certain Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

Certain Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

[This Letter of Charles the Great is put out by F. Mabillon in his *Analec.* Tom. I. p. 21.]

Insufficiency and Excusing.

These Ceremonies and various other Rites were to answer particularly and fully.

used by

the Church in Baptism in this Age, as in the former they had been, not as necessary Ingredients in Baptism, because they are not enjoined by the Word of God, but as useful to beget a Reverence to this Sacrament in the Minds of the illiterate Vulgar, and express to them the Vertue and Efficacy of it; for they Sometimes abolished Part of them, and always declared, that they attributed no Efficacy or Energy to them, but expected that from the joynt Prayers of the Church. This shews how differently they were used from the Use of them in the Roman Church, who place a sacred Operation in them, and make them necessary to Baptism.

Amalarius

composed, and caused to be composed several Books upon these Subjects, all which they dedicated to the Emperor.

Amongst others, *Amalarius Fortunatus*, Archbishop of Treves, writ a Treatise upon that Subject, which is to be found in the sixteenth Tome of *Canisius's* Collection, under the Name of *Alcuin*, to whom that Author attributes it upon a bare Conjecture only, without having any sufficient Proof; for in his MS. and some others there was no Name of any Author: But in another ancient Manuscript of Father *Petavius* it bears the Name of *Amalarius*. For indeed it is impossible it should be *Alcuin's*, for he dyed in 804. and this was written in Answer to a Letter in 811. This *Amalarius* was he that was sent the same Year along with *Peter*, the Abbot of *Nonantula*, to the Greek Emperor, *Michael Curolopates*. He was chosen Archbishop of Treves, and dyed in the Year 814.

Jeffé.

Jeffé, Bishop of Amiens, writ also an Answer to the Emperor's Letter, in which he relates very exactly and clearly all the Ceremonies of Baptism, with a very natural Comment upon every one of them. He speaks also of Confirmation, and the Eucharist conferred upon Infants at the Time of their Baptism. *Cordeus*, who was the first that publish'd this Letter of *Jeffé* at the End of *Hincmarus's* Works [at Paris 1615.] added thereto a short Explanation of the Manner of Administring Baptism, and of the Terms which are made use of in the Prayers, together with nine Canons or Instructions for Priests; but it is very plain this Addition does not belong to *Jeffé*, for it has no Relation to the Matter he treats of. His Letter ends at the Chapter of the Eucharist. What follows as far as the Canons, is the Work of another Author, whose Notions and Method are very different from his. The Canons are a Capitulary or Remonstrance for the Instruction of *Charles the Great*, which is to be found amongst the Collection of Constitutions, publish'd by *M. Baluzius*, pag. 531. This Letter of *Jeffé* is also extant in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, [Tom. 14. pag. 67.] This Bishop was sent by *Charles the Great* in the Year 802. to *Irene*, Empress of the East, and afterwards depos'd in 831. by *Ebbo*, Archbishop of Rheims, in a Synod held at *Nimiguen*.

Odilbert.

Odilbert, Archbishop of Milan, writ also upon the same Subject, whose Book was never yet printed. It is a Manuscript in the Abby of *Richemont*. Father *Mabillon*, in the fourth Tome of his *Analec.*, he publish'd the Letter, which serves for a Preface to the Treatise, with an Extract of the Treatise it self.

Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, writ also an Answer by the express Command of his Metropolitan, *Magnus*, Archbishop of Sens, to whom he dedicated it; and who also writ a small Treatise upon the same Subject, [Printed with some other Pieces of his by Father *Sirmondus* at Paris, 1646.]

The Church of Lyons was too considerable, and its Ceremonies too authentick, not to explain it self upon this Occasion. Whereupon *Leidradus*, Archbishop there, undertook to compose an Answer to the Emperor's Letter. This Letter has been put out lately by Father *Mabillon*, in the third Tome of his *Analec.* To which is annexed another private one to the Emperor; and likewise a small separate Treatise upon the Renunciations made at the Time of Baptism. We have over and above these, two other Letters of *Leidradus*. The first written also to the Emperor, where he gives him an Account of the Use he had made of the ancient Revenues of the Church of Lyons, which had been restor'd to him by his Orders. He says, he has established a Quire there, and whatever else is necessary to celebrate Divine Service. He acquaints him, that he had gotten Schools of Singers, who are very excellent in their Art, and are able to instruct others. That he has Readers, who not only read publicly, but are fit to expound and interpret. That he has caused a great many Ecclesiastical Authors to be transcribed; rebuilt and beautified a great many Monasteries, and other Religious Houses; and likewise erected a Cloyster for the Canons and Prebendaries, and many other Things both of Use and Profit. The second Letter of *Leidradus* is consolatory to his Sister upon the Death of her Son and Brother. The Works of *Leidradus* are in a plain and natural Style, but have nevertheless a great deal of Good Sense and very Christian Thoughts. These two last Letters are in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, [Tom. 10. p. 232.] *Papirius Massonus* and *M. Baluzius* have joyned them to the Works of *Agobardus*, to whom *Leidradus* resigned his See to retire into the Monastery of St. Martin at Soissons. There are other Anonymous Answers given to the Questions proposed by *Charles the Great* in his Letter. All these Authors give an Account of the Ceremonies of Baptism, and put a mystical Sense upon them, for the Instruction and Edification of Priests and Believers.

Lewis, surnamed the Kind or Godly, was not less curious than his Father, in endeavouring to understand the Ceremonies of the Church. *Amalarius*, a Deacon of Metz, to whom is also given the Title of Abbot in ancient Manuscripts, and whom some have called Suffragan, dedicated to him four Books of the Ecclesiastical Office, in his Preface of which he gives him great Commendations, concluding it with many Wishes for his long and happy Life. In these Books he relates the Ceremonies and Customs of the Church, according to the Roman Establishment, and gives mystical Reasons for them, which are in no wise to be thought the true Reasons for the Institution of these Ceremonies, but humane Inventions, and for the most part groundless Suppositions, and which I do not think myself obliged to give any Account of; therefore shall only take Notice of a few Points of Discipline in them, which are the most considerable. The first Book is about the Service of the Church from *Septuagesima* to *Pentecost*: Where he teaches us, that from *Septuagesima* to *Easter*, neither *Hallelujah*, nor *Gloria in Excelsis* were sung in Churches; that Lent began the Wednesday after *Quinquagesima*. That on *Holy-Thursday* they consecrated Oyls for the Sick, for the Catechumens, and those that were confirmed. That these three Oyls had three different Consecrations. That they mingled Balm with that used for Confirmation. That on *Good-Friday* they worshipped the Cross, and after they had brought out the Body of Christ (reserved the day before) they mixt it with unconsecrated Wine, which they thought sufficiently consecrated by this Mixture, and so gave it immediately to the People. But he takes Notice at the same Time, that in the Church of Rome the Priests only communicated. That the Service of Saturday was for Saturday Night till Sunday, and that they blest the Wax Candle. He speaks of some of the Ceremonies of Baptism made use of at that Time, and principally of the Unction, which was pour'd by the Priests on the Top of the Novice's Head. He seems to disapprove of the Fast upon Rogation, which he says, was instituted by St. Mamertus, and was never in use with the Eastern Churches. In the second Book he treats of the twelve Lessons of Divine Service, of the Fast of the four Ember Weeks,

Certain Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

Theodulphus.

Leidradus.

Amalarius

Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

* Of the Habits of Priests, see Durand. Ration. l. 3.

† Concerning these Parts of the Mass (533) if any desire to be exactly informed, let him consult Durand. Ration. l. 4.

* These Hours of Prayer, and the Reasons of their Institution, are at large explained by Durand, in his Rationale Divin. Off. l. 5. c. 3.—10.

Weeks, of the several Orders and * Habits of Priests, of which he gives very mystical Significations. The Priest's Vest signifies the right Management of the Voice, his Albe the Subduing of the Passions; his Shoes, upright Walking; his Cope, Good Works; his Stole, the Yoke of Jesus Christ; the Surplice, Readiness to serve his Neighbour; his Handkerchief, good Thoughts; and the Pallium, Preaching. The third Book treats of the Method observed in Celebrating Mass; of the Habits, of the Office of the Singers, of the Manner of the Bishop's going to the Altar; of the Place where he sits, of the Presenting of the Chalice by the Acolythus to the Subdeacon, who receives it; of the Mixing of the Sacramental Bread with the Consecrated Wine; and lastly of the Kiss of Peace. He discourses at the same Time of the Prayers which are said, viz. † Of the *Introitus*, the *Kyrie Eleison*, the *Gloria*, the *Collects*, the *Tractus*, the *Responses*, the *Hallelujah*, the *Offertory*, the *Secret Prayers*, the *Preface*, the *Canon*, the *Lord's Prayer*, the *Agnus Dei*, and the *Blessings*, which are given at the End of the Mass. He also adds some Reflections upon the Masses and Service used on *All-Saints-Day*, the *Advent*, *Christmas-Day*, and the *Purification*; upon the Hour of Celebrating Mass, and the Differences between the Masses for the Dead. We may thereby learn, that the Practice in his Time of Celebrating Mass was not different from what it is at present. But the mystical Reflections he makes upon these Ceremonies and Prayers are so far-fetched and incongruous, that there is no great Use to be made of them. He has one particular Observation to himself about the Body of Jesus Christ, which he divides into three States or Conditions. 1. Of Jesus Christ risen again, represented by that Part of the Eucharist which is put into the Chalice. 2. Of Jesus Christ upon Earth, represented by that which is consumed by the Priest. And, 3. The Body of Jesus Christ in the Tomb, represented by that Part which remains on the Altar. The last Book is upon the other Parts of the Divine Service; * As the Prayers for the First, Third, Sixth, None Hours, *Vespers*, *Completorium*, and Night-Office, as well for *Sundays* and Holy-days, as other principal Feasts of the Year. F. Mabillon, in the second Tome of his *Analec'ts*, has printed a Supplement to this fourth Book attributed to *Amalarius*. But it appears by *Agobard's* Book, writ against this Work, that the last Chapter of the 4th. Book, was the same with the last and 47th. in the Vulgar Editions: Also 'tis certain, that this Supplement is rather added by the Monk *Ademarus*, than the Work of *Amalarius*. Moreover 'tis plain, this Addition has no Connection or Conformity with the other Parts of that Treatise.

The same Author has writ another Book, called * *The Order of the Book of Anthems*, where he gives a Reason for the Order he has observed in the Book of Anthems, which he made for the Churches of *France*, in so disposing the Anthems, Responses and Psalms. *Ademarus* informs us, That *Amalarius* was also Author of a Treatise, named, *A Rule for the Canons and Canonesses*, published in the Council of *Aix-la-Chapelle*, which consists of nothing else but a Collection of Precepts and Canons, gathered from the Fathers and Councils, relating to the Lives of Clergymen and Monks. The Deacon *Florus* makes Mention of two other Books of *Amalarius*, made before the former, and adds a third, called *An Introduction or Preface to his Works*; but this we have altogether lost.

Mon. *Baluzius* amongst the Pieces which are at the End of the second Volume of his *Capitulary*, hath published some Eclogues of choice Reflections, upon some Places of the *Roman* Order, concerning the Ceremonies of the Mass, which go under the Name of *Amalarius*: But altho' this Work be very full of Reflections, much like those of *Amalarius*, yet it is very dubious whether they be his or no; for besides that it is not likely he would treat a second Time of the same Thing, only after a different Manner, of which he had spoken before in the third Book of his *Divine Offices*: It appears to me, that this Author's Style and Manner of Writing is something different from that of *Amalarius*.

There are five Letters of this Author's, in the seventh Tome of *Dacherius's* *Spicilegium*, [Tom. 6.] The first is directed to *Terence*, Archbishop of *Sens*, concerning the Manner of writing the Name of Jesus Christ, together with *Terence's* Answer. The second is on the same Subject, writ to *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, with that Bishop's Answer. The third is to *Rancarius* Bishop of *Noyon*, about the Meaning of these Words in the Gospel; *This is the Cup of my Blood, of the new and eternal Testament*.

The fourth is to the Monk *Hetton*, who was Abbot of *Fulda*, after *Rabanus*, about the Word *Seraphim*, whether it be of the Masculine or Neuter Gender; And the fifth is to *Gouard*, where he treats of this Question, viz. Whether a Person may be allowed to spit just after receiving the Holy Eucharist. It seems by this last Letter, that he believed that there was no Harm in Spitting some Time after, when one cannot easily forbear longer: And if it should happen that without their Knowledge or Will, they should let drop

some of the Eucharist, they need not much trouble themselves about it: Also, That he doubted whether Christ's Body once received did incorporate with ours, and accompany it to Death; or whether it evaporated through the Pores, or was exhaled in Air, or converted into Blood, or went into the Draught; so that this has given Occasion to some, to accuse him of the Error of the *Stercoranists*, as *Heribald* and *Rabanus* were. The Books of *Amalarius* were very ill receiv'd in *France*, and chiefly by the Church of *Lyons*, which would by no Means endure them. *Agobardus*, Bishop of this See, wrote three Treatises against his Offices and Book. *Florus*, a Deacon of the same Church, attack'd him very vigorously, and accused him in the Councils of *Cressi* and *Thionville*: First, about his Opinion of the Body of Christ, under three Forms, represented by three Pieces of the Sacramental Bread: Secondly, about his moral and mystical Significations of the Ceremonies of the Church, which he look'd upon as false Opinions and Imaginations without Grounds. Thirdly, Because he insisted only upon the *Roman* Order, and expounded it Word for Word; altho' he knew that this Book was unknown to the Archdeacon of *Rome*, of whom he had many Traditions.

Amalarius thus having attacked the Customs of the Church of *Lyons*, *Agobard*, who was their Archbishop, defended them in his Correction of the Anthem Book, to which his Treatise, of the Manner of singing Psalms in the Church of *Lyons*, serves for a Preface. He observes that the particular Customs of some Churches ought not to be reflected on. He approves of that of the Church of *Lyons*, in not singing new and fantastical Psalms, in not making use of Poetry in Divine Service, and by keeping exactly to the Scriptures. This was what *Amalarius* quarrell'd with, but *Agobard* vigorously defended it, and proved it highly reasonable and conformable to the Sense of the Church.

This Correction of the Anthem Book is dedicated to all Believers, but principally to the Singing-men of the Church of *Lyons*: He there gives Reasons for the Corrections he has made, and shews that he has only retrench'd all that was not taken from the Holy Scriptures: He gives particular Reasons for leaving out some Anthems, and proves that they were contrary to the Truth, and did not at all agree with Mysteries. He afterwards quotes several Places in the Fathers, to shew that it is necessary to endeavour to reform the Service, and to retrench those Errors and Abuses which are slid into it, either by Malice, Ignorance or Simplicity. He complains that there are some Clergymen, that spend their Lives more in learning to sing, than in studying the Holy Scriptures, and other Matters that relate to their Ministry: He says that the Ancients, to avoid this Disorder, chose rather to repeat the Psalm often, than to charge the Minds of those that sung with a great many superfluous Pieces. And lastly he concludes, That as the Church has a Mass-Book whose Doctrine is very pure, and a Collection of Lessons taken wholly out of the Holy Scriptures, so it ought also to have an Anthem-Book purged from all Errors and Humane Inventions, and composed out of nothing but the Bible.

This Treatise is followed by another against some Passages of *Amalarius's* Book, concerning the Divine Service: He reproves what *Amalarius* maintains, That on the twenty fifth of *April* might be used Litanies or Rogations, without Fasts and Abstinence; he laugh'd at what *Amalarius* had asserted, that upon that day they prayed publicly for Eggs, Bread and Fish. He finds Fault with *Amalarius's* Explanation of the Passage of *St. Paul*. He reproves divers Expressions and Notions of this Author; as when he says, that the Holy Ghost did drive all carnal Desires out of the Apostles Hearts: That Man, and by Consequence Jesus Christ, was created out of the four Elements; That Jesus Christ dyed for the Just and Unjust; That there are two Sacrifices, the one general for all Men, and the other particular only for the Saints: That the first is the Death of Jesus Christ, and the second the Prayers of the Just, which are united to the Sacrifices of the Angels: This Treatise of *Agobard* seems imperfect.

Rabanus or *Herbanus*, surnamed *Maurus* and *Magnentius*, has made himself very famous by his Works, which he has written concerning the Ceremonies and Discipline of the Church. He was born at *Mayence*, in the Year 788. He was put very young into the Monastery of *Fulda*, where he was brought up; from thence he was sent to *Tours*, where he study'd some Time under the famous *Alcuin*: He returned afterwards into *Germany* to his Monastery, where he was entrusted with the Government of the younger Monks, and was afterwards ordain'd Priest in the Year 814, and at last chosen Abbot of *Fulda* in 822. After having managed this Charge twenty Years, he voluntarily quitted it to satisfy his Monks, who accused him, that he applied himself too much to Study, and neglected the Affairs of the Monastery. He retired to the Mount of *St. Peter*, and was at last chosen Archbishop of *Mayence*, in the Year 847. He held a Council the same Year for the Reformation of Discipline, he condemn'd *Gotteschalens* a Monk of *Corbey* in another

Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church.

another Council, and sent him to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*; he dyed in the Year 856.

He excell'd all in the common Learning of those Times, such as expounding the Principles of Arts, as the Rules of Grammar and Rhetorick; in a Readiness of collecting from the Fathers of the Church, common Places upon the Holy Scriptures. In inventing Allegories upon the Histories of the Bible; in the Exposition of the myttical Reasons of the Ceremonies; in a Knack of turning Prose into Verse, and in the Manner of reducing his common Places into Precepts and Instructions. All the Works of *Rabanus* are of this Kind.

I shall not speak of the Grammar that is attributed to him, and which is nothing else but an Extract of *Priscian*, because these Kind of Works do not relate to our Subject; and that those that have writ his Life, and the Catalogue of his Books, have not mentioned it.

His Treatise, *De Universo*, or of the Signification and Propriety of Words, composed for *Haymon* Bishop of *Halberstat*, and sent to *Lewis the Godly*, is nothing but a Collection of common Places, about a great Number of Things. It is divided into twenty two Books, of which there are but the five first, which have any Relation to Ecclesiastical Affairs, the others being all about the Sciences and profane Arts. The first Book is concerning the three Persons in the Godhead; in the first Chapter he explains the several Names of God, and gives the Sence of such Expressions in the Scripture, as attributes the Members and Actions of Man to him. In the second he considers the different Names which are given to the Son of God, in the Old and New Testament. In the third he explains what relates to the Holy Ghost, which he affirms to proceed from the Father and the Son. In the fourth he treats of the Mystery of the Trinity, and in the last of the Names of Angels, and of their different Orders. In the second and third Books he searches into the Significations of the Names of the Patriarchs and Prophets, and other remarkable Persons in the Old Law. The fourth concerns the Church only; he there explains the Names and Parables in the New Testament, he takes Notice of the Signification and Etimology of the Words which are made use of in the Affairs of the Church, such as Clerk, Bishop, Martyr, &c. Also he distinguishes the different Sorts of Monks: he speaks of Heresies, and concludes with an Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church, which is taken, or rather copied out of the Treatise of *Gennadius*, upon Ecclesiastical Opinions. In the fifth he discourses of the Books of the Holy Scriptures; he makes a Catalogue of them, and adds moreover to those the Church has received as Canonical, some that have not been allowed by the Canon of the Jews. He sets down those that he believes to have been the Authors of the Old and New Testament, and makes an Abbridgment of their Works. He speaks also of the Restoration of the Holy Books by *Esdras*, of the Libraries of the Version of the *Septuagint*, and of other Versions of the Holy Scriptures; he extremely commends that of *St. Jerome*, and prefers it before all others, as being the most literal and clear. *Verborum tenacior & perspicuitate Sententie Clarior*. He treats also in the same Book of other Ecclesiastical Writings of Canons, or of Concordances of the Evangelists, of Definitions of General Councils, and of Ecclesiastical Offices. He comes at last to the Sacraments, and other Means of sanctifying us. He says, That Sacraments are Things which ought to be received holily; That Baptism, Chrism, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, are called Sacraments, because the Divine Grace works in them by the visible Signs; that they have their Effect, whether they be administered by good or bad Men; that Baptism remits Sins; that there are several Sorts of Baptisms, as that of the Holy Ghost, and that of Martyrdom, &c. That there are in the Church other Means of purifying our selves from our Sins, and principally Confession, Penance and Tears; that Chrism or Unction sanctifies us, and that the Priest lays his Hands upon us to endue us with the Holy Ghost; That as to the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, God has chosen Bread and Wine to shew us that his Body and his Blood is for our common Nourishment; That the Sacraments give Life to some and Death to others, because all receive them, tho' few have the Virtue and Benefit of them. He speaks lastly of Exorcisms, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, Lent, Publick Penance, and Litanies or Processions.

Rabanus's Work in Praise of the Holy Cross, is of a very particular Kind; it must needs have cost him a great deal of Pains and Study, tho' it be but of little Use. The Body of the Work is composed of Letters divided from one another, and ranged over against one another in Lines. In reading from the Right-hand to the Left, every Line contains an Hexameter Verse. These Letters thus rang'd in Lines, make a sort of a Draught or Platform, on which there are Figures or Symbols of the Cross painted; the Letters enclosed in these Figures make also Verses, which have some Relation to the Figure. There are 28 Figures in 28 Tables, the Verses are copy'd entire; afterwards at the End of every Table, and the Mystery explained in Prose. The first Table contains the Image of Christ, extending his Arms in the

Form of a Cross. The 47 Verses read long-ways, from the Right-hand to the Left, show the several Names that have been given to Christ, in the Old and New Testament. The Letters compriz'd in the Draught of the Figure compose other Verses; as for Example, Those that meet in the Crown about his Head, read round, make exactly this Verse, *Rex Regum Dominus Dominantium*. In the other Tables he represents many different Things upon the Cross, as the Angels, the Virtues, the Elements, Cyphers, Mystical Numbers, Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Beatitudes, Books of *Moses*, Names of *Adam*, *Alleluiah*, *Amen*, &c. In the last he represents a Cross, at the Foot of which is painted a Monk worshipping it, and in it these Words, *Rabanum memet clemens rogo, Christe tuere, O Pie, Judicio*. This first Book is explained by a second, which contains 28 Chapters in Prose. *Rabanus* undertook this Work at thirty Years of Age, and presented it a great while afterwards to *Gregory* the Fourth, to whom it was recommended as a wonderful Piece of Art by *Alcuinus*, who had been *Rabanus's* Master.

These are the Contents of the first Tome of *Rabanus's* Works; the second consists of four Books of Commentaries upon *Genesis*, four upon *Exodus*, seven upon *Leviticus*, with an Abridgment of them by *Strabo* his Scholar, four upon *Numbers*, and as many upon *Deuteronomy*. All these Commentaries are dedicated to *Freculphus* Bishop of *Lysieux*, at whose Desire he undertook them. *Rabanus* in his Epistle entreats him to examine them; and tells him, That he ought not to expect any Thing extraordinary from one that was more fit to work for his Living, than to write Books for the Use of the Learned, and besides, whose Charge of Abbot allowed him but little Leisure. The third Tome contains two Books of Commentaries upon *Judges*, dedicated to *Humbertus* Bishop of *Wirtzbourg*. One on the History of *Ruth*, four on the four Books of *Kings*, dedicated to *Hilduin*, four others upon the two Books of *Chronicles*, dedicated to *Lewis* Emperor of *Germany*. One Commentary upon the History of *Judith*, and another upon *Hester*. These two are dedicated to the Empress *Judith*. A Comment upon the *Canticles*, which is composed into Morning Hymns, for every Day of the Week, dedicated to *Lewis* King of *Germany*. Three Books of Commentaries on the *Proverbs* of *Solomon*, as many on the Book of *Wisdom*, and two upon *Ecclesiastes*. These two last are dedicated to *Otgarus* Archbishop of *Mayence*. The fourth Tome consists of nineteen Books of Commentaries upon the Prophecie of *Jeremiah* and his *Lamentations*, twenty upon *Ezekiel*, dedicated to the Emperor *Lotharius*. And two more on the two Books of *Maccabees*; the first is to *Lewis* King of *Germany*, and the other to *Geroldus* Archdeacon of that King's Chapel. The fifth Tome contains eight Books of Commentaries upon the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, directed to *Aistulphus* Archbishop of *Mayence*: And lastly, thirty Books of Commentaries upon the Epistles of *St. Paul*, written at the Request of *Lupus* of *Ferrara*, and dedicated to the Bishop *Samuel*. Many Homilies upon the *Sundays*, Feasts and Holydays of the Year, and also upon divers Points of Morality, dedicated to *Aistulphus* and *Lotharius*. A Treatise of Allegories upon all the Scripture, where, after having explained the Difference between Tropology, Analogy, and Allegory, he ranks in Alphabetical Order, many Words of the Holy Scriptures, to all which he gives an Allegorical or Mystical Sense.

Those Authors that have mentioned *Rabanus's* Works, add to these several other Commentaries, upon *Joshua*, *Esdras*, *Tobit*, *Job*, the *Psalms*, *Isaiah*, *Daniel*, the Minor Prophets, the Gospels of *St. Mark*, *St. Luke*, and *St. John*, the *Acts of the Apostles*, and Canonical Epistles, and some others which have never yet been printed. All these Commentaries consist of Nothing else but Collections out of other Mens Works, which be copy'd from them without any exact Choice or Distinction.

The sixth Tome of *Rabanus's* Works contains many Books; the first and most considerable of all these, is his Treatise of Instruction of Clerks, divided into three Books. He compos'd it for the Monks of *Fulda*, who propounded to him divers Questions about their Duty, and dedicated it in the Year 819. to *Aistulphus* Archbishop of *Mayence*. The first Book treats of the several Ecclesiastical Degrees and Habits of Clergymen; also of the four Sacraments of the Church, as Baptism, Chrism, the Body and Blood of Christ, and the Service of the Mass according to the *Roman* Order. The second is upon the Liturgy it self, the Canonical Hours, Fasts, Confessions, Penance, Holydays, the Rule of Faith, and about Heresies; the last is of Ecclesiastical Knowledge and Studies.

In the first, after having observed that the Church is an Assembly of Believers, he divides it into three Sorts of Members; first Laymen, secondly Monks, and thirdly Clerks: He observes, That the Clergy are admitted into it by Shaving the Crown, which is a Ceremony that demonstrates, that they ought then to part with all Vice and disorderly Living. It seems they did not then content themselves to cut off a little Hair, but shav'd all the Top of their Heads, leaving only a Circle round about, which *Rabanus* believes to

Questions
about the
Rites and
Ceremonies
of the
Church.

to have been a Mark of the Royalty of the Christian Priesthood. He reckons up eight Ecclesiastical Orders; the Porter, the Quirister, the Reader, the Exorcist, the Acolythus, the Subdeacon, the Deacon, the Priest, and Bishop. He says, That this last must be ordained, not by one Bishop only, but by all those of his Province; lest so great Power being trusted to a single Person, he should undertake any Thing prejudicial to the Faith. He adds, That in consecrating him he has a Staff put into his Hand to admonish, that he is not only to guide, but correct the People committed to his Charge; and a Ring, to denote either the Honour of the Priesthood, or the Secrets he is to keep. He counts three Sorts of Bishops; first Patriarchs, secondly, Archbishops or Metropolitans, and thirdly, single Bishops. He adds moreover Suffragans, which he compares to Christ's Disciples, who could do nothing without their Master's Orders. These Sorts of Bishops were Establish'd for the Sake of the Poor in the Country, that they might not be depriv'd of Confirmation, which these Suffragans had Power to confer upon them, tho' they were ordained by one Bishop only, as the Priests are. He tells us, that these last were also called Bishops, and that they had the Power almost equal to theirs, for they could consecrate the Eucharist, confer Baptism, and preach. But nevertheless they had not the chief Dignity of Priesthood, *Pontificatus Apicem*, since they could not anoint the Forehead with Chrism, and bestow the Holy Ghost, which two only belong to the Bishops, as it appears by the *Acts of the Apostles*; neither can they confer Holy Orders, which is also reserved to the Bishops. The Deacons are Ministers of sacred Things, they have Right to baptize, they are necessary in the Service of the Altar, for the Priest cannot take the Chalice from thence, but must receive it from the Hands of the Deacon. The Subdeacons are under them; these take the Offerings of the People, and carry them to the Deacons, who place them upon the Altar; they are oblig'd to live unmarried: These are not ordain'd by Imposition of Hands, but only by receiving the Cover and Chalice from the Hands of the Bishop; and the Chrismal Bottle and Napkin from the Archdeacon. He says nothing particular of the lesser and inferior Orders. I shall pass by the Remarks he makes upon the Likeness of our Ministers with those of the Old Testament, and the Mystical Significations he gives to the Bishops Habits. To come to what he teaches concerning the Sacraments, he says, That Baptism, Chrism, and the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ are called Sacraments; because that under the Vail of Corporal Things, the Divine Power produces Salvation and Grace after a secret Manner, by the Power of the Holy Ghost, which works this Effect, inasmuch that they are equally efficacious, whether they be administered by the Good or the Bad. That Baptism is the first, because it must be received before Confirmation, and before the Receiving the Body and Blood of our Lord. That in this Sacrament Men are dip't in Water, to denote, that as Water outwardly purifies the Body, so Grace inwardly does the Soul, into which the Holy Ghost descends. He relates afterwards the Order of Administration, and the Ceremonies of Baptism; and from thence passing to Confirmation, he remarks, that the Bishop dispenses the Holy Ghost by Imposition of his Hands; and that he anoints the Believer a second Time with the same Chrism the Priest had done before, with this Difference only, that his Anointing is on the Forehead, whereas the Priest's was on the Crown of the Head. He attributes to this last Unction the Sanctification and Grace of the Holy Ghost. At last speaking of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, which he considers as two different Sacraments; He asks the Question, Why Jesus Christ has comprehended the Mystery of the Body and Blood under Things which we eat and drink? And why of all these Sorts of Food we eat, he has made Choice of Bread and Wine? To which he answers, That Jesus Christ has given us his Body and Blood in the Form of Nourishment, because effectually his Flesh is such and his Blood Drink. That he hath made use of the Fruits of Earth, because he was upon Earth, and that he has chosen Bread and Wine to accomplish the Sacrifice of *Melchisedech*, and to show that as Bread and Wine consists of many Particles, which together make but one Substance, so we are all united into the same Church by the same Charity, being all made Members of the same Body by this Sacrament. He adds, That this Sacrament serves for Nourishment to our Flesh, and converts it self into our Substance, and that by Vertue of this Sacrament we are changed into Jesus Christ. That we participate of his Spirit and Grace; and in a Word, that we become his very Members. That the Bread which is made use of is without Leaven, to denote, that those which approach it ought to be exempt from all Impurities. That Water is mixt with the Wine, because we read in the Gospel, That Blood and Water came out of the Side of our Saviour. And that as it is good for them that are not separated from it by their Sins; often to approach this Sacrament, so it is very dangerous for such as have committed such Crimes as debar them from it, to receive it before they have repented. After having treated of

the Sacraments, he speaks of the Celebration of Mass, which he believes to have been so called, because of the Dismissal of the Catechumens with these Words, *Ita, Missa est*. He says, That the Mass is a Sacrifice which the Priest offers to God, instituted by Jesus Christ, practis'd by the Apostles, and used by all the Church. He acknowledges that at first they did not sing as they do at present; but he believes they read the Gospel and the Epistles of the Apostles; he ends this Book with a short Exposition of the Ceremonies and Prayers of the Mass.

In the second Book, after he hath spoken of the Hours for Divine Service; and the different Sorts of Prayer, he treats of the Confession, the Litanies or Publick Prayers, and the divers Kinds of Fasts. He distinguishes three Sorts of Lent, the first, that which precedes *Easter*; the second, the Fast observed after *Pentecost*; and the third, that which begins in *November* and ends at *Christmas-day*. He notes, that the Custom of his Time was to fast *Friday* and *Saturday*. He does not forget to speak of the Fasts of the four *Ember-weeks*. He approves of other Fasts ordered by the Bishop on any particular Occasion, or practis'd thro' Devotion by Christians. In speaking of abstaining from Wine and Flesh, he observes, that Birds are allowed to those who are forbid to eat of any four-footed Creature, because that 'tis thought, they were formed out of Water as well as Fish.

He distinguishes two different Sorts of Alms, and ranks amongst this Number the good Works we do for our Salvation, which are as Alms we bestow upon our selves. He defines Penance; a Punishment, by which a Man corrects himself for what he has done amiss. He says, that Penitents let their Hair and Beards grow, wear Sackcloth, throw themselves on their Faces on the Ground, and besprinkle their Bodies with Ashes. That Repentance is a second Remedy for our Sins, after Baptism. That to effect a true Repentance, it does not suffice only to bewail one's Sins past, but we must never commit them again. That this is the Satisfaction, followed by Reconciliation. That Penance and Reconciliation ought to be publick, for publick Transgressions; but as to those whose Sins are conceal'd, and who have confest them secretly to a Priest or a Bishop, they may do private Penance; such as the Priest or Bishop will order; and afterwards be reconciled when they have performed their Penance. That the ordinary Time for Reconciliation is *Holy-Thursday*, but Absolution may be granted at other Times to those that are in Danger of their Lives. He afterwards treats copiously of the solemn Celebration of Feasts and *Sundays*. He speaks by the By of the Oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass for the Dead, of the Dedicating of Churches, the Prayers of Divine Service, the Songs, the Psalms, Hymns, Anthems, Responses, and Lessons. He makes a Catalogue of Canonical Books, which comprehends all that are at present acknowledged for such. He tells you those that he believes to have been Authors of the greatest Part of them. He speaks of Ecclesiastical Benedictions, viz. That of Oil, and that of Salt and Water; which he says, are made use of to comfort the Sick against the Illusions of the Devil, to heal the Flock, and to drive away Distempers. At last, having spoken of the Apostles Creed, and given an Abridgment of the Doctrines agreeable to the Faith, he sets down a very imperfect Catalogue of Heresies, in which he forgets some, and reckons others which are altogether unknown; as the *Canonians* and *Metaniphismonites*.

The last Book is concerning the Learning of Clergymen. He says, they are not allowed to be ignorant of any thing they should teach others, and which is necessary to render them capable of instructing them. That they ought to understand very well the Holy Scriptures, not only the Historical Part, but be able to expound the Figures and Mystical Sense of it. That it is good for them to have a Tincture of other Arts and Sciences. That they be civil and Regular in their Manners, and affable and courteous in their Speech. That they be of an acute Judgment, and know how to apply proper Remedies to the different Diseases of the Soul. He afterwards makes Use of the Words of St. *Gregory the Great*, to reprove those who undertake to teach others, and cure Souls, without being very well instructed in their Duty themselves: I mean such as enter into the Ministry merely through the Prospect of Interest or Ambition, and those that dishonour God by an irregular Life, whose Deportment does not answer their Doctrine. He says, That the Ground and Perfection of Wisdom is the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, which is an Emanation of the eternal Wisdom of God, and a Participation of his Truth. That all the Wisdom and Truth that Men have, and all that is to be found profitable in Profane Writers, is to be attributed to the Divine Wisdom, which gave it a Beginning. That the Scripture has its Obscurities, which are good to exercise Mens Wits: But there are scarce any Truths contained in one Place, which are not explained in another, *Nilis autem de illis obscuritatibus eruitur quod non plenissime dictum alibi reperitur*. This is taken from St. *Austine's* Treatise of Christian Doctrine, as well as the rest of this Book; which

is nothing but an Extract from this Father, excepting what he says upon the seven Liberal Arts, upon which he quotes a Passage taken out of the Pastoral of St. Gregory.

The Book of Orders, Holy Sacraments, and Priests Habits, which followeth this, is almost nothing else but a Copy of the first of the three foregoing Books: It is very near the same with the three Books of Ecclesiastical Discipline; for the two first are nothing but an Abridgment of those of the Instruction of Clerks, to which he has added some Passages out of St. *Austine*. In the last, which is about the Christian Warfare, he treats of Virtues and Vices.

* Dr. Cave adds a 3d. which the first is about the Vision of God, and the second upon Penance, are made up of Passages out of the Fathers *De Puritate Cordis*: upon these Subjects.

Or, The three Books of Questions about the Rules of Penance, Purity of do not belong to *Rabanus*. The first and second are *Haligarius's*, Bishop of *Cambray*, and the third an unknown Author's.

The three Books of Virtues and Vices belong to the same *Haligarius*, who has also made a Penitential at the Request of *Ebbo*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, divided into five Books, and published under his Name by *Canisius*. These are not much different from the five Books, which here bear the Name of *Rabanus*.

But the Penitential dedicated to *Osgar*, Archbishop of *Mayence*, is certainly the Work of *Rabanus*, which he composed towards the Year 841. before he was Bishop of *Mayence*. [This Tract is printed alone at *Venice*, 1584. *Quarto*.]

The Name of a Penitential has also been given to the Letter which he wrote to *Heribaldus*, Bishop of *Auxerre*, published by *Stewart* in his Addition to the Antiquities of *Canisius* [at *Ingoldstat*, 1616.] and by *M. Balusius*, at the End of *Regino*, [at *Paris*, 1671.] But this is a Canonical Letter, in Answer to some Questions propounded by that Bishop. It is divided into Articles, and quoted by *Regino* and the Collectors of Canons. He there gathers together many Canons concerning the Penances of Homicides, Adulterers, Forsworn People, Sorcerers; and about the Punishments of those that commit any great Crimes after they are admitted into Holy Orders, and about other Circumstances of Penance and Absolution. But towards the End he treats about two Questions much debated in his Time. The first about the Eucharist, Whether it goes into the Draught? A Question that has been spoken of before. And the second about *Ebbo*, old Archbishop of *Rheims*, who after his Deposition, retired to *Hildesheim* in *Saxony*, where he exercised his Episcopal Functions. He says, that he knows not whether he was justly or unjustly deposed; but nevertheless that it did not hinder him from doing the Duty of that Office: For he had heard that he was afterwards re-established by the Holy See. He adds, That he had lately written thereupon to *Hincmarus*, after he understood that he had removed from the Priesthood and Clerkship, all those who had been ordained by *Ebbo* after his being deposed. This Letter of *Rabanus* was written about the Year 853. a long Time after the Penitential, of which we have spoken before.

Rabanus's Letter to *Humbert*, about the Degrees of Consanguinity, within which 'tis forbidden to contract Marriage, is also a Work of the same Nature. In it after he hath related the Opinions of *Theodorus*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, and *Isidorus*, he says, 'tis his Judgment, that a Man may marry after the fifth Degree of Consanguinity: And that if there be any Marriages found within that Degree, without their Knowledge they were so near of Kin, they might be suffered to continue married, only enjoying them Penance, and exhorting them to live in Abstinence from the Marriage-Bed.

Humbertus not being satisfied with this short Answer, sent him some new Questions about this Subject; and also ask'd him what he thought of Fortune-tellers Divinations? *Rabanus* answers him in a longer Letter, in which he shews, that he was in the Right to make use of the Chapter in *Leviticus* to regulate the Degrees of Consanguinity, within which it is forbidden to marry: Because that this Law related to Manners, and that the Precepts of this Kind have not been abolish'd by Jesus Christ. He afterwards relates a Passage of St. *Austine*, which explains the Passage of *Leviticus*. Another Passage in the Answer of St. *Gregory* to *Austine* the Monk; and a great many Canons concerning the Degrees of Consanguinity, in which it is forbidden to contract Marriage. In the second Part, after having spoken of the Artifices of Magicians or Sorcerers, he concludes, That we ought to take Care how we apply our selves to them for the Cure of any Distemper, or to find Things that are stollen or lost.

In his Book of the Soul, he treats briefly, contrary to his ordinary Custom, about such Questions that respect the Original and Nature of our Souls. He says also, that it is a disputable Point, whether God created it to be infused into our Bodies; or whether it be produced from the Souls of our Fathers and Mothers. He maintains, that it is altogether Spiritual, and has no particular Figure, although its principal Seat be in the Head. He says, it is not less in

Infants than more aged Persons; and that it is of the same Nature in all Men, though the Inequality of Organs hinders it from acting every where alike. He treats afterwards of the principal Virtues of the Soul, of the Form of the Body, and of the Senses.

The Treatise of the Rise, Life, and Manners of Anti-Christ, contains a Description of his Life and Actions, framed out of what is said of him in the Holy Scriptures: That he should be of the Race of the *Jews*, and of the Tribe of *Dan*: That he should be born according to the Order of Nature, of a Father and Mother: That at the very Minute of his Conception the Devil should enter into his Body, and always dwell there: That he should be born in *Babylon*: That he should extend his Dominion to a great Distance. That he should do Signs and Prodigies. That he should stir up a great Persecution against all Christians. That when he should come, the *Roman* Empire would be entirely ruined, and Judgment would be at hand. That he should call himself Christ, and draw all the *Jews* after him. That he should also sit in the Temple of God, that is to say, the Church. That he should have *Elias* and *Enoch* for his Fore-runners. That they should be killed after three Years and a half's Preaching. That the great Persecution of Anti-Christ should commence from their Death, and that it should continue three Years and an half; but that although the Anger of God should be enflamed against him, and that he should be slain by Jesus Christ, or the Angel *Michael* armed with his Power. That 'tis thought this shall be on the Mount of *Olivet*. That the Judgment shall not follow his Death immediately, but that God should grant some Time to those that have been seduced, to repent, and acknowledge their Transgressions.

At the End of these Works we find *Rabanus's* Verses, in which he confesses, that his Writings are only Collections and Composites out of other's Writings.

The Martyrology attributed to *Rabanus*, is very short, and seems to be a Genuine Piece: It has already been published by *Canisius*, [*Antiq. Lest. Tom. VI.*] We owe to the Jesuit *Brokverus* the Collection of *Rabanus's* Poetry, where there is Sence and Wit, although it is every where full of Barbarous Terms, and have neither Elegance nor Politeness.

The Commentary upon the Rules of St. *Benedict*, attributed to *Rabanus*, belongs to the Abbot *Smaragdus*, as we have noted before.

The List of some *Latin* Words rendred into High *Dutch* Terms, and the Figures of the Letters or Characters of the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, *Latin*, and *Teutonic* Tongues, are taken from the second Tome of the History of *Germany*, composed by *Goldastius*, which are such ancient Pieces, that they may very well be attributed to *Rabanus*. These are the whole Contents of the six Tomes of this Author, printed at *Antwerp* in the Year 1626. bound in three Volumes in Folio. [And by the Care of *Georgius Colvenerius*, at *Colen*, 1627. *Fol. Vol. 3.*]

There have been since published some other Works of *Rabanus*. For without reckoning the three Letters of Predestination and Grace, written against *Gotschalvus*, and published by *Sirmundus* [at *Paris*, 1647. *Octavo.*] of which we have spoken, *M. Balusius* has given us in the last Edition of the Works of *M. de Marca*, two Treatises, which without Doubt do belong to *Rabanus*, and which are most elaborate, useful, and better written than any of his other Works. The first is dedicated to *Drogo* Bishop of *Metz*, which is concerning Suffragans. Opinions were then divided in the *Gallican* Church, about the Dignity and Power of Suffragans; some affirmed they were real Bishops by their Ordination, and that they might ordain Priests and Deacons, confirm, consecrate Altars, and do all the Office of a Bishop: But others denied this, and affirmed that their Ordinations and Confirmations were null and void. *Charles the Great* consulted Pope *Leo* the Third upon this Question, who answered, That he was certain that Suffragans had not this Power, and that all they had done belonging to Bishops, was *ipso facto* void, and that they ought to be deprived of any such Power. The Council of *Ratisbon* followed the Pope's Advice, and ordered them to remain in the Rank of Priests.

This Decision did not hinder, but that there were yet Suffragans in many Diocesses, and that the Bishops did still allow them Privileges which belonged only to them. There has always been many Churches, and chiefly in *Italy* and *Spain*, where Suffragans have been esteemed no more than ordinary Priests, where they re-ordained such as were made Priests or Deacons by them, confirmed anew those they had been confirmed by, and consecrated anew such Churches as they had consecrated: *Rabanus* having understood this, undertook to defend the Suffragans. He says, that their Order had its Original from the Times of the Apostles; and that they had such Assistants who could Ordain and do the same Offices with them. He believes that St. *Linus* and St. *Cletus* were Suffragans to St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* in the Church of *Rome*. He accuses those Bishops that undervalue Suffragans, and who look upon them no more than ordinary

Questions about the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church. nary Priests, of overthrowing the Order by their Ambition. He endeavours to prove by the Canons of the Councils of *Ancyra* and *Antioch*, that Suffragans might Ordain thro' the permission of their Bishops, and that they have received the Episcopal Consecration and Ordination. He asserts, That if Suffragans had not this Right, they would be of no Use to the Bishops as they now are: And upon what was objected against him, that it is said in the Acts, that the Apostles themselves had been sent into *Samarina*, to bestow the Holy Ghost on those that were newly baptiz'd; He answered, that the Apostles were sent thither, because there was then no Suffragan at *Samarina* but only the Deacon *Philip*, who had baptiz'd them. The rest of the Treatise contains some Admonitions to the Bishops about Humility.

The other Treatise of *Rabanus*, publish'd by *M. Balusius*, is concerning the respect Children owe to their Parents, and Subjects to their Prince: It was writ upon the occasion of the Conspiracy of *Lewis the Godly's* Children against their Father. *Rabanus* there quotes several places in the Scripture, which prove, that every one ought to obey his Prince and his Parents. He confirms these Truths by Examples, and shews in particular, that it was never permitted to a Subject, to take Arms against his Sovereign upon what account soever. He mightily condemns those Children who would deprive their Parents of their Estates. He speaks against unjust and rash Judgments, openly blaming that which the Bishops pronounc'd against *Lewis the Godly*. He shews plainly that Clergymen ought not to meddle with Secular or Temporal Affairs. He maintains, That none can Condemn or put to publick Penance, a Sinner that accuses himself, unless he be otherwise convicted. He adds, That those that are sorry for their Sins and are converted, deserve forgiveness. At last addressing himself to the Emperor, he exhorts him to despise the false Judgments given against him; and advertises him, that he

* Merit Pardon—Heaven.] Under the word Merit, which is often met with in the Fathers, The Church of Rome, which generally couches her new and false Doctrines, under old Names, would have us understand a Merit ex condigno, whereby we deserve Heaven as a just reward of our Works; whereas they mean a Merit of impetration, as a conditional qualification for happiness.

may nevertheless with good Works * merit Heaven. He counsels him, not to be surprized at the attempts of his Enemies, but to be encouraged by the truth of the Gospel, and to believe in his Judge and his King, who has given him a Crown on Earth, and promised him one in Heaven. He tells him, that if the Conspiracy of his Enemies have done him any wrong, he should trouble himself but little about it, but be thankful to his Defender and Saviour Jesus Christ, who afflicts and chastizes all those that he loves. He exhorts him in fine, not to seek after any Revenge, but heartily to forgive all such as have offended him. This Treatise is Elegant and well Written.

M. Balusius, has also published in the first Tome of his Miscellaneous Works, his Treatise about the account of Time, directed to *Macarius*. *Rabanus* writ this when he was a private Monk, in the Year 820. This Book is written by way of Questions and Answers. It treats of all that relates to the Kalendar; as Days, Months, Years, Epochs, Cycles and Easter. These Matters, tho' they be very obscure, are here treated of with a great deal of Exactness and Method.

The same *M. Balusius* hath put out in another of his Works, (viz. his Collection of some ancient Acts, which he has put at the end of his Capitularies) a Letter of *Rabanus's* to *Regenbaldus*, Suffragan of *Mayence*, about some Questions, that *Regenbaldus* had propounded to him, about several cases. The first is concerning a Person who having beaten his Wife, had caused her to bring forth a dead Child. He answers, he ought to be dealt with as a Manslayer. The second is about a Person, who having been bit by a Dog, applyed immediately some of his Liver to the Wound, as most likely to heal it. He excuses him that did this through Ignorance; but he says, he ought to be warn'd of committing the like again. The third is concerning such as are guilty of the Sin of Bestiality. He condemns them to suffer the Punishments specified in the ancient Canons. The fourth is, Whether it be lawful to eat the Calves brought forth by Cows polluted with the Abominations of Men? He Answers, that that is not forbid to his knowledge. The fifth is concerning the Penance of those that have voluntarily, involuntarily, or otherwise killed their Parents and other Relations. He refers these to what has been said about Homicides. In the Conclusion he tells this Suffragan, that he may moderate Canonical Punishments with Prudence and Discretion.

There is at the end of the eighth Volume of Councils, in the last Edition, another Letter of *Rabanus's* to the same *Reginbold* or *Reginbald*, about other Questions of like nature with the former. The first is concerning those that carry away and sell Christians to Pagans. He Answers, that they ought to be subjected to the Penance of Homicides.

The second is about Infants, who are stifled by lying with their Fathers and Mothers. He says, that although these Children came by their Death, contrary to the knowledge of them that were the cause of it; nevertheless they ought not to be exempt from doing some Penance; and if they knew it, they ought to have been punish'd as Homicides. The third is about the degrees of Consanguinity, within which it is forbid to Marry. He sends him upon this Question, the letter which he writ to *Humbert*. The fourth is concerning the Sins of Fornication or Adultery amongst Relations; *Rabanus* hereupon quotes divers Canons. The fifth is, whether it be lawful to pray for a dead Slave, who had run away from his Master. *Rabanus* says, that we ought not to refuse to pray for him, if he had committed no other Crime; but withal, that we ought to admonish other Slaves not to commit the like. The sixth is concerning a Man, who pleading to be a Priest, altho' he was none, had administred the Sacrament of Baptism. *Rabanus* says, it ought not to be reiterated, if it was conferred in the Name of the Holy Trinity. The last is about those that eat Flesh in Lent, and who swear by Relicks. *Rabanus* answers, that they do very ill, and that they ought to be made to do Penance for their Crime.

Walafridus Strabo, (so called, as some think, because he was Squint-Ey'd) a Monk of *Fulda*, Scholar of *Rabanus*; afterwards Dean of *St. Gallus*, and Abbot of *Reichenou*; followed and imitated his Master, not only in Composing a Glosse upon the whole Bible, collected principally out of his Commentaries: But also in making a Treatise about the Beginning and Progress of Divine Worship, dedicated to *Reginbert*, in which he explains particularly what relates to the Ceremonies of the Church. This Work has been printed in the Collections of Writers concerning Divine Offices, [by *Cochlaus* at *Mentz*, 1549. and *Historpius* at *Paris*, 1610.] and also in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, [Tom. XV.] The principal Points which he handles in this Book are these:

He says about the Original of Altars and Temples, that *Noah*, *Abraham* and *Isaac*, erected them in Honour of God. That *Moses* was the first that Built a Tabernacle for the People to Worship God in. That *Solomon* afterwards Built a Temple, which was preserved a great while by the Jews. That Pagans, and Authors of false Religions, have imitated in this the Worship of the True God; in honouring Devils and false Gods with the like Ceremonies. That when Christians, who are the true Worshippers of God in Spirit and Truth, began to set up Places for their Worship, they always sought out pure Places, distant from the Noise and Hubbub of the World; where they might quietly offer God their Prayers, Celebrate the Holy Mysteries, and Comfort one another. That they have sometimes made Use of their Houses for that Purpose, but the Number of them encreasing, they were forced to build Churches. That oftentimes to avoid Persecution, they have met together in Caves, Caverns, Church-Yards, and other private Places; but at length, Religion being fully Establish'd, they Built new Churches, and turn'd the Temples of their false Gods, into those of the True. That they then did not much mind in what Situation their Churches were Built, although the common custom has been since, to turn towards the East to Pray. That at first they had no Signal to call them to the Assemblies. That some were led thither by their Devotion, others had notice of the Day and Hour at their last Meeting, and others by reading it upon certain Tables, set up in their Assemblies for that purpose. That they afterwards made use of an Horn and Trumpet, and at last of Bells, the larger of which are called *Campane*, and the lesser *Nolæ*; so named from the Town of *Nola*, where they were first used. Having explained the Names of Church, Temple, Basilick, and their parts, together with the Barbarous name of the *Oficion*, he goes on to Discourse of Images, the Abstracts of which, I shall for some Reasons forbear to set down here.

He proves afterwards, that Altars ought to be consecrated, and so passes from the material Parts of Churches, to what is to be done in them. He says, that Praises ought there to be Sung to God, the Gospel Preach'd, and Baptism Administred. That a great deal of Care ought to be taken, to keep them from Profane Uses. That Prayers there ought to be short and pure, and accompany'd with Tears; and that they ought to proceed from Hearts worthy to be the Habitation of God, who loves the Offerings of Virtues better than any Corporeal Gifts. That nevertheless God accepted the Oblations of the Patriarchs, and the Sacrifices of the Jews, till such time as Christ, which they represented, was come. That he by his coming, has caused all Sacrifices to cease, and has established new Mysteries, having given the Sacrament of his Body and Blood to his Disciples; and commanded them at the same time to Celebrate it in Commemoration of his Passion. That he has chosen for this Mystery, the Species of Bread and Wine, to signify the Union betwixt the Head and its Members; and that Water is mixt with the Wine, to shew, that the

People ought not to be separated from Jesus Christ. That these Mysteries are called Sacraments, because of the Secret Virtue, by which they work our Sanctification. That it is for this Reason, that such as cease to be Members of Jesus Christ, by committing Capital Crimes, are excluded from these Sacraments, for fear that if they should approach them, they should be made worse, or be Corporally punish'd : and to the end, that the terror of this Separation might engage them to Repentance. He takes notice, that heretofore other things than Bread and Wine were offered upon the Altar ; and that in some Places at *Easter*, they sacrific'd a Lamb, which was laid upon the Altar, or the side of it, and which they afterwards eat ; but he altogether disapproves of this Practice. He afterwards shews there was great reason, that the Eucharist should be received in *Lent*.

As to what relates to frequent Communion, he observes, that some have thought it enough to Communicate once a Year, and that others communicated every *Sunday*, and many upon all Holy-days ; that afterwards they added some solemn Days for Fasting. He approves of their Practice, that communicate and say Mass every Day, provided they be free from great Sins. He adds also, that there were some Priests that would not celebrate Mass above once a Day, and that there were others, who believed themselves obliged to say it three or four times ; for according to the Church of *Rome*, there are sometimes two or three Masses appointed for one Day, as for *Christmas-day* and some Feasts of Saints. He gives every Priest the liberty of using them as they think fit, provided they don't condemn each others Practice. As to the Prayers of the Mass, he says, that no body knows by whom they were established, as they now are ; and that the Apostles celebrated it, after a plainer and most unaffected manner : *Quod nunc Agimus multisque Orationum, Lectionum, Cantilenarum, & Consecrationum Officio, totum hoc Apostoli, & post ipsos proximi (ut creditur) Orationibus & Commemoratione Passionis Dominice, sicut ipse precepit, Agebant simpliciter.* That the Ancients say, that they did, as we do now on Holy [or Good] Friday ; and that after they had repeated the Lord's Prayer, and made Commemoration of Christ's Passion, they received the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. That afterwards the Offices of the Church were enlarged, as well as the Ceremonies. That the *Romans* added to what they received from *St. Peter*, what else they thought fit. That their usage was admired by so many People, because they were a famous Nation, and were taught by *St. Peter* himself, the Head of the Apostles ; and because there never was a Church in the World so free from Heresies. That *St. Ambrose* compos'd a Form of Prayer for his Church, and for the Churches of *Liguria*. He fixes upon the *Roman* Order, and explains the parts of it, taking notice of the Popes, to whom some attribute the Institution of them. He wishes, that they would Communicate at every Mass ; and observes, that the time of communion is before the Prayer, which is said at the end of the Mass, in which they commonly Pray for those that have communicated. And although he acknowledges, that Priests may offer and communicate alone ; nevertheless he says, *Illam esse legitimam Missam cui intersunt Sacerdos, Respondens, Offerens & Communicans.* As to the hour of the Mass, he observes it is different, according as the Solemnities of the day will permit ; that sometimes it is before Noon, sometimes towards three a Clock in the After-noon, sometimes in the Evening, and sometimes at Night, but never before nine a Clock in the Morning. He speaks afterwards of Holy Vessels and Priests Habits. He makes several Remarks upon the Hours of Divine Service, of which these are some of the most considerable. That the *Irish* kneeled down often ; that the Distribution of the Psalms into many Parts of the Service, was not begun before the time of *Theodosius*. That about the same time they began to Sing Hymns in the Church of *Milan*, and to celebrate Vigils. That *St. Ignatius* goes for the Institutor of Anthems. That the name of Hymns may be given to all Psalms of Praise, altho' they be not in Verse. That there are a great many Churches, where they are never sung in Verse. That *St. Ambrose* was not the Author of them all. That the *Gloria Patri* is differently express'd. That the *Spaniards* Sing it thus ; *Gloria & Honor Patri, & Filio, & Spiritui sancto in secula seculorum, Amen.* And the *Grecians*, *Gloria Patri, &*

Filio, & Spiritui sancto, & nunc & semper, & in secula seculorum, Amen. That the *Latins* add, *Sicut erat in Principio.* That 'tis thought to be the Council of *Nice* that instituted this Hymn, that many put it at the end of those Hymns which they divide into a great many Parts, as those which follow the Service of *St. Benedict*. That the *Romans* use it not so often in their Psalms, as they do in their Responses : That all the Offices begin with, *Deus in Adjutorium*, except that for the Dead, and that for the Holy Week, [or Week before *Easter*.] That the *Romans* still Sing the Psalms, according to the Edition of the *Septuagint*, but the *French* and some of the *Germans*, according to the Correction of *St. Jerome* ; that *Stephen* the III. coming into *France*, introduced the *Roman* way of Singing there.

Strabo, after having finish'd what related to the Divine Service and its several Parts, treats of the Administration of Baptism. He says, That the Ceremonies of Baptism have been encreased by little and little, that the *Unction* of Christ was added to it, which no body doubts but was taken from the Old Law. That from the very first, Confirmation was administered by Imposition of Hands, which was then always conferr'd by the Bishops, and so is still. That the solemn times of administering Baptism, are *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, that some have added *Christmas-day* and the *Epiphany*. That in case of necessity Persons may be baptized at any time. That they may be baptized by Dipping Sprinkling, or Plunging the Infant in the Water once or thrice. That at the beginning of the Church, Baptizing of Adult Persons was more frequent ; because that those which were converted, were capable of being instructed in the Principles of Religion, and in answering for themselves. That as for Infants, they had God-fathers and God-mothers to answer in their Names, who are obliged to put them in mind, when they come to have the use of their Reason, of the Promise, that they have made for them.

He passes afterwards to Tythes, and shews that they ought to be given to the Clergy, who must divide them into four Parts, whereof one is for the Bishop, another for the Clerk, a third for the Poor, and the last reserved for the Buildings of the Church. He does not forget to speak of the Litanies or Processions, used in the Days of Rogations, establish'd by *Marcellinus* ; but he observes, that some keep them between *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, according to the Council of *Orleans* ; but the *Spaniards* defer them till after *Whitsuntide*, and others to *December*. He adds, That the Name of the Litany does not only signify, that Prayer by which the Saints are invoked, but also every sort of Prayer, by which we ask any favour of God. He speaks afterwards of the Sprinkling of the Holy Water, of the Consecrating of Wax-Candles, and ends with an enumeration of the several Orders of Clergy, which he compares to Civil Employments. These are the several Orders of the Clergy. The Supreme Bishop who enjoys the See of *Rome*, and holds the place of *St. Peter*, being rais'd to the Dignity of the Head of the Church. The Patriarchs of other Churches, who are equal in Dignity to the See of *Rome*, which are of *Antioch* in *Asia*, and *Alexandria* in *Africa* ; besides these three Patriarchs, there are many others which are inferior to them [as the Patriarchs of *Constantinople* and *Ephesus*.] The Archbishops are above the Metropolitans, to whom succeed in order the Metropolitans, Bishops, Abbots, Great Chaplains, Little Chaplains, Suffragans, Priests that are possessed of Churches where they administer Baptism, and Priests who have the Government of private Chappels, Arch-Priests that have the charge over Canons, Arch-Deacons who have care of the Bishop's Family. Then Deacons, Sub-Deacons, Exorcists, Porters, Acolythus's, Readers, and Singing-men. This is an exact Abridgment of this Work of *Walafridus Strabo*, which treats of Matters very rationally. He seems to have read a great deal. He often quotes the false Decretals of the Popes, and sometimes cites Apocryphal Histories. There is another small Treatise of this Author's, upon the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, and a great deal of Poetry, publish'd by *Canisius* [Antiq. Lec. Tom. 6.] The Lives and Miracles of *St. Gallus* and *Othmarus*, publish'd by *Surius* [Oct. 16. & Nov. 16.] The Life of *Blainus* Abbot of *Isi*, and the Visions of *St. Wittinus* in *Sec. Benedict. IV.* of Father *Mabillon*. *Walafridus* dyed in the Year 849.

CHAP. XIV.

Such Orders and Constitutions relating to a Monastick Life, as were made by the Authors of this Age.

Orders relating to a Monastick Life.

Benedict Abbot of *Aniana*

Benedict, Native of *Languedoc*, Son of *Aigulphus*, Earl of *Maguelone*, having past some time at the Court of *Charles* the Great, retired into the Abbey of *St. Sequanus*, in the Diocese of *Langres*. The Abbot of this Monastery being dead, they would have

chosen him in his Room, but he refused it, and returned to *Languedoc*, where he erected near the River *Aniana* a Monastery, which afterwards became very considerable. The Reputation of this Holy Abbot was so great, that he was chosen to govern divers Monasteries, and to effect a Reformation

Orders relating to a Monastick Life.

Reformation in all the Abbiés of France. Being invited to the Court of *Lewis the Godly*, he Built the Monastery of *Indus*, near *Aix-la Chapelle*; he was present at the Council held in 817. in that City, and framed Statutes for the Monks. He dyed in his Monastery of *Indus* in the Year 821. He has made a Collection of all the Rules and Orders of Monks, both of the *East* and *West*; and another Work, in which he shews the Conformity of other Orders with that of *St. Benedict*. The first is entituled *Codex Regularum*, i. e. a Book of Rules; and the second, *Concordia Regularum*, or a Harmony of Rules. The first has been publish'd at *Rome* by *Hollstenius* [1661.] and since printed at *Paris* in Quarto, in the Year 1663. by *Billaine*. And the second publish'd by *Father Menardus*, and printed at *Paris* in 1648. At the end of the first, there is a Collection of Works of Fathers, proper for Monks. It is compos'd out of the Pious Treatises of *St. Athanasius*, *St. Basil*, *Evagrius* and *Faustus*; also out of other writings about a Monastick Life. There is also another Collection of Passages of the Fathers, which also bears the name of *Benedict of Aniana*, compos'd of Extracts, out of the Works of *St. Jerome*, *St. Augustine*, *St. Ephraim*, *St. Cesarius*, *Cassian*, *St. Fulgentius*, &c. There are also some other small Treatises of this Abbot, as a *Penitential* printed in the Addition of Capitularies [by *M. Balusius*.] A Confession of Faith, which is to be seen no where but in Manuscripts, and a few Letters.

Ardo Smaragdus, a Scholar of *St. Benedict of Aniana*, and a Monk of his Monastery, has written the life of his Master, publish'd by *Father Menard*, and insert'd in the first Tome of *F. Mabillon's Sac. Benedict. IV.*

We ought not to confound another *Smaragdus* with the foregoing. This was Abbot of *St. Michael*, in *Lorraine*; he taught humane Learning to his Society, as it appears by his Commentaries upon *Donatus*, and other Profane Authors. He wrote a Book concerning the Duty of a Prince, under the Title of *Via Regia*, i. e. The King's way, which he dedicated to *Lewis the Godly*, who was made King of *Aquitain*, by his Father *Charles the Great*. He has also written Sermons upon the Epistles and Gospels, throughout the whole Year, collected for the most part out of the Fathers: Likewise a little Treatise for Instruction of Monks, entituled *Diadema Monachorum*, or Monk's Crown, and a Commentary upon the Rule of *St. Benedict*, which he explains and confirms in many Places by other Rules. *Charles the Great* made use of him to write to *Pope Leo*, about the procession of the Holy Ghost. And also writ the Acts of the Conference, held at *Rome* in the Year 809. and upon the same Subject. The Book intitled, *The way of Kings*, was publish'd in the fifth Tome of *Dachernius's Specilegium*. His Sermons were printed at *Frankfort*, in the Year 1536. The *Monk's Crown* at *Antwerp*, in 1540. And the *Commentary* upon the Rule of *St. Benedict*, is published amongst the Works of *Rabanus*, printed at *Colem*, in the Year 1625. (where it was printed before in 1575.)

Hildemarus a French Monk, called into *Italy* about the Year 830. by *Rampertus* Bishop of *Bresse*, who committed to him and *Leutgrinus*, the care of Rebuilding the Church of *St. Faustinus* and *St. Jovitus*. He has written a Commentary upon the Rule of *St. Benedict*. This Work has never yet appeared in Print. Some have attributed it to *Paul the Deacon*, but it is none of his, and it ought to be restor'd, according to the Manuscript of *Dijon*, to *Hildemarus*. There is also in the thirty eighth Chapter, a Letter writ by *Hildemarus* to *Ursus* Bishop of *Beneventum*. This Author dyed in the Year 840.

We may also place amongst those Authors that have written concerning Monastical Discipline, *Lupus*, Abbot of *Ferrara*, whose Letters contain divers Laws and Instructions for a Monastical Life. He was Born about the beginning of the ninth Century. He was certainly of the Province of *Sens*, and of a very considerable Family. He was brought up to Learning, and was admitted betimes into the Abbey of *Ferrara*, where he was soon after Profest under *Aldricus*, who was then Abbot, and afterward Archbishop of *Sens*. He was sent into *Germany* to the Abbey of *Fulda*, there to Study the Holy Scriptures under the famous *Rabanus*, who at his desire, compos'd his Commentaries upon the Epistles of *St. Paul*. *Lupus*, who was then but Deacon, made great Progress in Ecclesiastical Knowledge, under so able a Master, and returned to *France* with great Reputation, in the Year 830. He was presented to *Lewis the Godly*, by the Empress *Judith*, and stayed some time at Court, in hopes of obtaining some Abbey. It was at this time that he receiv'd the Order of Priesthood: Afterwards he was chosen by *Charles the Bald*, to supply the place of *Odo* Abbot of *Ferrara*, whom this Prince resolv'd to deprive of his Monastery, because he had favoured the Party of *Lotharius*. Being come thither by the King's Order, he was received for Abbot in *November* 842. and drove out *Odo* from the Abbey in the Year 844. He assisted at the Council of *Vernueil*, and was ordered to compile the Canons. He assisted at divers other Assemblies of Bishops, Vol. II.

and was sent to *Pope Leo the IV.* by *Charles the Bald*. He assisted at the Council of *Soissons* in the Year 853. and Orders reliv'd in great Reputation for Knowledge and Piety, till the Year 862.

There has been a Collection made of 130 Letters of this Abbot's, upon different Subjects. There are divers upon the difficulties of Grammar, and other Civil Matters; but there are some which relate to Ecclesiastical Affairs, and which treat of some points of Doctrine, Discipline, and Morality.

The fourth is a very Christian Consolation to *Eginhardus*, upon the death of his Wife, who was Daughter to *Charles the Great*. This is an answer to the third Letter of *Eginhardus*, written to him; in which he declared, that he was not capable of Comfort under his Loss. He says, That it afflicted him most, that the hopes he had put in the Intercessions and Prayers of the Martyrs were all in vain. *Lupus* answers him, in that point, that his Vows and Prayers, that have not been heard for a Temporal Good, will serve to procure him Eternal Life; and that he does not in the least doubt, but that this Death will be Advantagious both to him and his Wife; because it was more convenient that he should die last, it being likely that he had the greatest Strength to bear this Affliction, and to resist the troubles that are suffered in the World: That oftentimes God does not grant us what we ask, but what is most fitting and convenient for us. That God perhaps had taken away his Wife, to reconcile the Division that was in his Heart, between Her and the Lord, and to Unite all his Love in this only Object. He tells him at length, that tho' it be seemingly out of his Power to end his Grief, yet he ought to have recourse to the Goodness and Mercy of God, and resign himself entirely to this Sovereign Physician, who easily heals those Wounds that men think most Incurable. Then he exhorts him, to ask of God Eternal Happiness for his Wife; and for himself Perseverance in good Works, growth in a Spiritual Life, and Christian Consolation. About the end he speaks of a Book of *Eginhard's*, upon the Adoration of the Cross, and thanks him for dedicating it to him. We have lost this Work.

In the eleventh Letter he Petitions *Lotharius*, in the Name of the Monks of *Ferrara*, to let them enjoy the Revenue of the Monastery of *St. Josse*, upon the Sea, which *Charles the Great* had given to *Alcuin*, and to the Monks of *Ferrara*, to maintain Pilgrims, and relieve their Necessities. *Rhodingus* obtain'd it of *Lotharius* by Surprise: He begs of him to restore it; and conjures him to it by the respect he owes to the Holy Virgin, *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, through whose Intercession they daily pray God for his Health and Salvation.

In the twelfth, writ to *Pardulus* Bishop of *Laon*; he desires this Bishop to use his Interest with the King, in favour of the Monks, of the Monastery of *St. Columbus* of *Sens*, who were going to Court, to recover the Privilege of Exemption, which had been granted them by the Archbishop of *Sens*, and by the Kings. *M. Balusius* observes upon this Letter, that the Kings were then able to Exempt Abbies from ordinary Jurisdiction. That that of *St. Columbus* had been put under the Jurisdiction of *Jeremy* Archbishop of *Sens*, by *Lewis the Godly*, and afterwards taken from him. That after this it lost its Liberty again, under *Charles the Bald*, but soon recovered it again; as it appear'd, by a Charter from this *Charles*, dated the 13th. of *November*, 847. which serves to fix the date of this Letter. *M. Balusius* adds also many other Examples to shew, that the Exemptions of the Monasteries of *France*, were granted and settled by the Authority of Kings, who took them into their Care, Management and Protection, *sub tuitione*.

It appears by *Lupus's* 18th. Letter, that he was charged with care of the Abbey of *St. Amandus*, without ever seeking it: That he was glad when he was rid of it; and that he was sent to a General Assembly called by the King, near *Paris*.

In the 19th. *Lupus* being informed of the Poverty of a Monastery, of the Diocels of *Auxerre*, by a Monk of the same Monastery, who was come into his; gave *Heribald* Bishop of *Auxerre* notice of it, and desired him to remedy it.

The 20th. is about some difficulties of Grammar; he takes notice towards the end of a very remarkable thing, which was, that *Probus* a Priest of *Mayence* had begun a Book, in which he placed *Cicero*, *Virgil* and others; that he believ'd to have lived well, amongst the number of the Elect; for fear it should be said, that Jesus Christ had unprofitably shed his Blood, and did nothing when he was in Hell. These are his Words, *An certe inchoatam Satyram, quod magis existimo, Scribens Ciceronem & Virgilium, Caeterosq; opinione ejus probatissimos viros, in Electorum Collegium admittat, ne frustra Dominus sanguinem fuderit, & in Inferno otium triverit*. It is to be thought, that this *Probus* did not speak this seriously, as you will be convinced, if you please to consult *M. Balusius's* Notes upon it.

The 21st. Epistle of this *Lupus's* is an Excuse to *Jonas* Bishop of *Orleans*, that he had accus'd *Agas* his Kinsman of having

having wrong'd the Estate that his Monastery had in his Diocess. He makes an Apology also for taking his Predecessor *Odo's* place. The 23^d. 24th. 25th. 26th. 27th. and 28th. are some Letters of this *Odo* about Affairs relating to his Monastery.

The 29th. Letter, dedicated to *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens*, is very remarkable. Two Priests of this Diocess, one call'd *Adegarus*, and the other *Baudrius*, having a design to turn Monks, had desired of the Archbishop that they might leave their Churches or Cures, *titulos*, to enter into the Order of *St. Benedict*. *Wenilo* answer'd them, That he would not give them this permission, unless *Lupus*, into whose Monastery they were to be admitted, would satisfy him it might be done regularly and lawfully. *Lupus* writ him word, that he had never heard it question'd; and that without doubt it might be done. That Jesus Christ having taught that the perfection of a Christian Life consists in quitting all, and leaving the World, Clergymen sure ought not to be hindred embracing that perfection which Jesus Christ propos'd even to Laymen. Hereupon he makes a strong Objection, and answers it. You will object perhaps, says he, that as none are allow'd to break the carnal Union of Marriage, unless it be for Fornication; so none are permitted to quit the Pastoral Charge, which they have once undertaken, as long as they are able to labour for the edification and salvation of their Flock. This is true, answers he, unless he that has establish'd the Marriage does break it himself, or he that has charg'd us with the Government of others, does secretly command us to quit it. For he that has forbidden any man to put asunder those whom he has join'd together, the same great God hath made this separation himself when he has pleas'd, because he is God. For we have many Examples of vertuous Persons of both Sexes, that have quitted all carnal Commerce to serve the Lord in holy places. He adds, That there has scarce been any Monastery whereinto some Priests have not retired. He quotes amongst the rest one of his Predecessors, an Abbot of *Ferrara*, call'd *Frugalphus*, who had quitted the Habit of Canon, to take upon him the Profession of a Monk. He says that *Aldricus*, the Predecessor of *Wenilo* had resolv'd before his death to leave his Archbishoprick and retire into a Monastery. That it is not to be thought that these great men were ignorant of the Canons and Rules of the Church. That the Apostles and Clergy of the Primitive Church had in some measure practis'd a Monastical Life, by putting their Goods in Common. That there may be bad Monks among them, but that he ought to have Episcopal Compassion for them. And, in fine, that there is no surer way to Salvation, than by entering into that religious Order prescrib'd by *St. Benedict*. Whole Constitution, so much commended and approved by *St. Gregory the Great*, shews that we may, and we ought to receive Priests into our Monasteries, since he allows them to enter, and the Abbot to receive them, altho' with greater difficulty and precaution than others. Then he entreats *Wenilo* to allow these two Priests that Liberty they had desired. This Letter teaches us, first, That Priests, who had Ecclesiastical Charges, ought not to quit them to become Monks, without leave of their Bishop. And *M. Balusius* confirms this in his Annotations by an Example of a like permission requested and granted by *Arnoldus* Bishop of *Lisieux*. Secondly, That Bishops might give this permission, or refuse it. Thirdly, That Curates were so closely link'd to their Churches, that it was not in their power to leave them, nor in the Bishops to take them away from them at their pleasure; which *M. Balusius* confirms in his Notes by divers Canons and very curious Remarks.

The 30th. directed to *Gotescalcus*, contains an Explanation of the Passage of *St. Austine* concerning Happiness. He shews that this Saint believed, that God would make himself clearly known to the Blessed, and that this knowledge would engage them inviolably to him. That this knowledge of the divine Substance belong'd only to the Soul, but that the Eyes of the Body should perceive his presence by the admirable Effects it should work upon the Creatures. Thus he expounds what *St. Austine* says, that God shall be seen by the Eyes of the Body. He advises *Gotescalcus* not to perplex his mind with such Questions, for fear they make him incapable of understanding and teaching Matters of better use.

The 35th. Letter contains an handsome Reflection on the study of good Literature. He observes that it ought to be join'd with the study of Wisdom and Virtue. That if we labour to correct the Defects of the Tongue, we ought not to be less diligent to reform the Vices of our Manners. That if one has a great deal of care to polish his Discourse, he ought to apply himself more vigorously to acquire Virtue and Goodness. He exhorts him to whom he writes, to live like a Christian in whatever Condition he engages in, and to make often and serious Reflections on his Duty towards God.

In the 42^d. and 43^d. Letters written to *Hincmarus*, he employs his Interest with *Charles the Bald*, to get the Re-

venue of *St. Joffe* restored to him, making use of the Poverty of his Monastery to persuade him to it. He also recommends it to King *Charles* in the 45th. Letter, and humbly shews him, that for fifteen Years, or thereabouts, seventy two Monks of his Monastery, that prayed continually for his Health and Prosperity, had endured great want of Habits, Pease and Fish, (*M. Balusius* concludes from hence that they eat no Flesh) and that they could not relieve the Poor and Pilgrims. He entreats him to consider seriously upon their Wants, and to bestow some Charity upon them. He mentions in the 42^d. Letter, a Vow that *Charles* had made by *Hincmarus's* solicitations, in the Church of *St. Dennis*. He also there tells us that he compiled the Canons of the Council of *Verneuil*.

In the 51st. Letter he writs to his Monks that he had some hopes to recover the Revenue of *St. Joffe*. Where you may meet with this fine thought, that the Abbot ought to have the Charge and Government of the Revenues of the Monastery, but the Enjoyment of them only in common with the other Monks.

In the 53^d. Epistle he presses King *Charles* vigorously to restore him this Revenue; and the better to engage him to it, he informs him, that his ancient Monks have observed, and heard of their Predecessors, that all that have ever done any considerable damage or wrong to their Monastery, have been punish'd either by the loss of their Estates, their Health, or their Lives. He exhorts him to perform the Vows he has made; and moreover, threatens him with the Judgment of God if he doth not.

In the 55th. Letter to *Marcuadus* Abbot of *Provins*, he entreats this Abbot to come to Court to assist him in obtaining the Restitution of the Revenue of *St. Joffe*. He informs him, that he came thither the last of *November*, and has continued there with a great deal of expence and trouble. That the King endeavours to elude his Demands, and always delays him, because that *Odulphus*, (who then was possessor of *St. Joffe*) was absent and sick, as he was inform'd, but not very grievously (says he) so that this sickness may serve to humble and correct him: Nor so dangerously as to be the cause of his death, for which he should be sorry, because 'tis certain he would be damn'd if he should die, in the unjust possession of the Revenue of the Church. At length *Lupus*, after many delays and put-offs obtain'd the Restitution of the Revenue of *St. Joffe*, as it appears by the 61st. and 62^d. Letters. The 64th. Letter is an Instruction to King *Charles* concerning his duty.

The 79th. contains an Extract of a Letter written to *Hincmarus*, by which he recommends his Kinsman *Hilmeradus* to him, who was named by the King to be Bishop of *Amiens*; affirming, that tho' he had not much Learning, yet he might be made serviceable to the Church by following his directions. And that if he was not well fitted for Teaching the Word of God, yet he might do Works that might save him, and those that should imitate him. *M. Balusius* in his Notes declares himself of a different Opinion with his Author, and says, that in this he has hearkened more to the Sentiments of Nature, than the Principles of Reason.

The 81st. Letter is written in the name of *Wenilo* Archbishop of *Sens* and Count *Girard*, who were sent to *Amolo* Archbishop of *Lyons*, by the King's Orders, to command him to Ordain *Bernus* Bishop of *Autun*. They represent to him, that 'twas not a new thing for the King to make Courtiers Bishops of the principal Churches. That *Pepin* had in the like Case the Consent of Pope *Zachary* in a Synod, where *Boniface* Bishop of *Mayence* assisted. They also desired the same thing of him for *Godesfeldus*, named by the King Bishop of *Chalons*.

The 82^d. Letter is written to *Wenilo* in favour of a Priest, accused and suspended from the exercise of his Function. *Lupus* desires *Wenilo* to give him liberty to exercise his Duty, till a Synod were call'd, in which he hoped to clear himself of the Charge brought against him.

The 84th. is a Synodical Epistle of a Council held in the Year 849, consisting of the Metropolitans of *Tours*, *Rheims*, *Rouen*, and about twenty of their Suffragans, whose names are set down at the beginning of this Letter, directed to *Nomenius* Duke of *Breton*, about the Disorders he had committed. They reprove and blame him for having laid waste the Lands belonging to the Christians, for having destroy'd, pillag'd, and burnt several Churches, together with the Reliques of Saints, for seizing upon the Revenues of the Church, which are the Vows of the Faithful, the Satisfaction of Sins, and the Patrimony of the Poor, for having taken away rich mens Estates, and kill'd and enslaved a great Number of Christians, for driving the Bishops from their Churches, and robbing them of their Goods, &c. But principally for having slighted the many Letters of *Leo* the 4th. Successor to *St. Peter*, to whom God hath given Supreme Power over all the Church. Of having entertained *Lambert* Count of *Nantes*, a Rebel against the King. They exhort him to do Penance, and to satisfy that which the Pope writ to him about. And finally, they declared those

those excommunicate that shall communicate with Lambert.

The 93d. is an Instruction to King Charles, to whom he proposes Trajan and Theodosius, as two Patterns worthy of his Imitation.

In the 94th. he shows, That Afflictions and Sufferings are advantageous to good Men.

The 98th. is a Letter written in the Name of the Cathedral Church of Paris, of the Abbies of St. German, St. Denis, St. Geneva, St. Maurus des Fosse, and other Monasteries, to Wenilo, Archbishop of Sens, and to the other Bishops of that Province, acquainting them that after the Death of their Bishop Ercanradus, they had chosen Aeneas, who had been nam'd to them by King Charles, whom they desired them to ordain as soon as they could. This Letter is followed by an Answer written in the Name of the Bishop of Sens, and his Suffragans, testifying their Approbation of their Election of Aeneas.

The 100th. Letter is an Admonition to the People, wherein they are exhorted to do Penance, to avoid Rebellions and Factions, to imbrace a Peace, to forbear Robberies and Plunder, to think of nothing but Publick Good, and to live in Union with one another.

The 101st. is a Letter of Recommendation, written in the Name of Wenilo, to the Bishops of France and Italy, in Favour of two Monks of Ferrara, who went to Rome, desiring them to afford them an Hospitable Reception by the Way. This is followed by a Letter written in the Name of Lupus upon the same Account.

By the 103d. Letter he recommends these two Monks to Pope Benedict, to whom he sent them. He entreats him to instruct them in the Customs of the Church of Rome, and to send him the Commentaries of St. Jerom upon Jeremiah, from the sixth Book to the End, being not able to find them any where in France. He adds to this, the Book of Cicero de Oratore, Quinsilian's Institutions, and Donatus's Commentaries upon Terence, &c.

In the 105th. he promises to receive and deal mercifully with a Monk that had quitted his Habit and Order, provided he would amend, and behave himself better for the Future.

In the 108th. he thanks Lotharius for sending him this converted Monk. And excuses himself for not letting him be his Secretary, because there was no Likelyhood that a Monk, who had not all imaginable Diligence, would ever be able to do his Duty in the midst of the Affairs and hurries of the World. *Quoniam propositum nostrum vix medicriter intra Clausura Monasterii custoditur, nedum inter tumultus Mundanos a quolibet praesertim non satis cauto valeat adimpleri.* The following Letter is also about the Return of this Monk. It is to be noted that Lupus says in the first Letter upon this Subject, that he could not receive him without the Consent of his Brethren.

In the 12th. Letter Lupus condemns those that in commending Virginitie blame Marriage.

In the 124th. he clears himself to Wenilo of the Accusation that Erard had preferred against him in the Synod of Savoniers.

The 128th. and 129th. Letters are those mention'd before, which Lupus sent to answer the Questions concerning Predestination and Grace.

The last is a Fragment of an Epistle written in the Name of Wenilo Archbishop of Sens, to Pope Nicholas I. concerning Herimanus Bishop of Nevers, who was Non compos mentis. He there alledges that Pope Miltiades was of Opinion, that a Bishop could not be depose without the Consent of the Pope. He desires Nicholas to send him this Decree of Miltiades, such as it is at Rome; and he assures him he will wait his Judgment, how to make use of it against this Bishop, Whether he shall keep to the Moderation observed by St. Gregory towards the Bishop of Rimini, or whether he should immediately depose him according to the Decree of Gelasius.

Pope Nicholas did not answer this Question about the Decree of Miltiades; but having enlarg'd upon the Commendation of the Archbishop of Sens's Conduct, he acquaints him concerning Heriman, that he is not enough instructed in his Business; that tho' Heriman be Non compos, he ought not to be allow'd to come to the Synod; that if he has no other Defect than a Weakness of Mind, he ought to be

pitied rather than punish'd. And that as to the Lewdness and Extravagancies he us'd to be guilty of, he ought not to be condemn'd for them, as well because he is absent, as because he is not inform'd what those Extravagancies are; and then, whether he committed them in his right Wits, or when he was not himself. This Letter in the MS. from whence Father Sirmondus took it, bears the Name of Servatus Lupus; which shows that 'tis the Abbot of Ferrara's, who is so called, and by Consequence that the Treatise about the three Questions of Goteschalus, belongs also to him; besides, that this Book and these Letters are of the same Style, and that the same Doctrine is expounded in the 128th. and 129th. Letters, which are as it were an Abridgment of the other Work. Inomuch that there is no Reason to believe that Lupus Servatus was any other but the Abbot of Ferrara. 'Tis likewise believ'd that he took this Surname after he had been cured of a very dangerous disease, thro' Intercession of St. Faron, as it is related in his Life, written by Hildegarius Bishop of Meaux, a Cotemporary Author.

I have already given you an Extract of Lupus's Writings upon Predestination and Grace. He has also written the Lives of St. Maximinus Bishop of Treves, of St. Wigbert an Abbot, with two Homilies and two Hymns upon the same Saint.

Two great Men of our Age have given very different Judgments of Lupus Abbot of Ferrara, in Relation to a Monastical Life. One blames the inordinate Love he had for curious Learning, and his great Inclination for prophane Sciences, which, he says, is a Study unworthy of a Monk; and it would have much better become him to have lamented his own and the World's Sins in his Cloyster, and to have supported his Brothers, than to hunt after, and study with so much Diligence the Works of profane Writers. This is the Judgment given of him by the Abbot de la Frappe. Father Mabillon on the contrary thinks him an Ornament of the Monastical Order; a Man that was not less to be esteemed for his Piety, than his solid Doctrine. So well known and valued in his Time, that there was no Council held without him; and whom they always employed in the most important Affairs, as the best Instrument and Secretary of the Bishops, and chiefest Churches of France. A Man extremely well versed in the Fathers; and who in short was to be admired both for his Religion and Holiness, and the great Veneration he brought to the Monks of his Monastery; as Hildegarius observes; *Pastor modò pro Religione Sanctitatis in Monasterio famosissimo Ferrariensi, ubi Coetus Monachorum in Christo cum illo toto Orbe est venerandus.*

It does not belong to me to judge of the Monastical Conduct of Lupus Abbot of Ferrara, neither am I fit to decide the Judgments of two Persons so learned as the Abbot de la Frappe and Father Mabillon, for both of which I have a very singular Respect. But in keeping to my Subject, that is, considering Lupus as an Ecclesiastical Writer, I may say, That he was not only very knowing in general Learning and prophane Sciences, but in the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, and the Works of the Latin Fathers. And that he writ, not only with Elegancy, Pleasantness and Politeness, but also with a great deal of Solidity and Exactness.

His Letters were publish'd the first Time by Papirius Massonus out of a Manuscript of the Abby of Ferrara, and printed in the Year 1597. This Edition is very erroneous. M. Du-chesneus has since obliged us with one more correct, [In his Collection of French Historians, Tom. 3.] The Treatise of the three Questions, and the Letters about Predestination and Grace, have been printed at Paris in 1648. from an ancient Manuscript of St. Amandus, and since by M. Mauguinus, together with a Collection of Fathers upon the same Subject. Father Sirmondus has publish'd the two Letters, and the Book of the three Questions [in 1650.] The same Author has put out a Fragment of the 130th. Letter, taken out of a Manuscript of the Abby of Fleury, which was communicated to him by Father Dacherius. The Life of St. Maximin, with that of St. Wigbert, has been publish'd by Busseus, who had caused it to be printed with the Letters of Hincmarus at Mayence, in the Year 1602. and the two Homilies upon this Saint in 1604. At last M. Balusius publish'd a very fair Edition of all Lupus's Works, enrich'd with learned Notes, and many Pieces added at the End of the Volume in Octavo, printed for Muguet in 1664. [From whom it is put into the Biblioth. Patrum, Tom. 14. p. 1.]

C H A P. XV.

Commentaries upon the Holy Scriptures written in the Ninth Century.

SUCH as in this Century have apply'd themselves to the Study of the Holy Scriptures, have rarely produced any Thing of their own, but only made Collections out of the Commentaries of the Fathers. After this Manner are those of *Rabanus*, *Pascharius*, and the ordinary Gloss of *Walafridus Strabo* composed; of all which we have spoken before. *Florus* a Deacon of the Church of *Lyons*, followed the same Method, and gathered together a great many Books, out of which he made divers Collections. And amongst others, a large Commentary upon the Epistles of *St. Paul*, taken from fourteen *Latin* Fathers; and which has never yet been printed. Another Commentary upon *St. Paul*, composed of Extracts out of *St. Augustine*, commonly attributed to *Bede*, altho' it really belonged to *Florus*. It is printed amongst the Works of *Bede*. He has beside this composed a Treatise about the Celebration of the Mass, entitled, *De Actione Missarum*, which is a Comment upon the Canon of the Mass printed in the *Biblioth. Patrum* [Tom. 15. p. 62.] Also two Discourses upon Predestination; and another upon the same Subject against *Johannes Scotus*.

Florus's Writings.

You meet some Fragments of the first Discourse in *Hincmarus*. The second has been publish'd by *Father Celler* and *Montieur Mauguin*. This last has also oblig'd us with *Florus's* Book against *Johannes Scotus*, spoken of before, [Both at *Paris* 1650.] He has also made a Collection of Ecclesiastical Laws, of which there are two considerable Fragments quoted in another Collection of Manuscripts, whereof the first was publish'd by *Father Dacherius* in the 12th. Tome of his *Spicilegium*; and the other by *M. Baluzius* at the End of *Agobardus's* Works. The first consists of Laws and Canons against the *Jews*, and the Judgments of the Bishops. The second is concerning the Elections of Bishops, which he proves ought to be made by the Clergy and People. Lastly, *Florus* is Author of some Poetry, and there is a great deal of Likelihood, that those which go under the Name of *Drepanius Florus* in the *Biblioth. Patrum* belong to him. For there is one Poem inscrib'd to *Moduinus* Bishop of *Autun*, and another to *Wulfinus*, who both lived in the ninth Century. So that it must needs be acknowledg'd, that the true Author of these Poems was *Florus* the Deacon of *Lyons*, whom we now speak of. *Father Mabillon* has also publish'd in the first Tome of his *Analec'ts* some other Poetry of this Author's, of the same Nature with the former. The first Poem is a Complaint about the Division of the Kingdom, after the Death of *Lewis the Godly*. The second is a Letter to *Moduinus* Bishop of *Autun*, in which he complains that this Bishop suffer'd the Church of *Lyons* to be abused. The third is in Honour of two Martyrs, call'd *St. John* and *St. Paul*. The fourth is in Honour of *St. Stephen* the Proto-Martyr. The fifth is concerning the Reliques of *St. Cyprian*, which are generally believed to be at *Lyons*. And the last is the Inscription of an Altar, under which there were some Reliques of certain Martyrs; and upon it was pourtrayed *Christ*, the Apostles, and *St. John Baptist*. There was also a third Piece dedicated to *Moduinus*, of which *Father Sirmondus* published the Beginning in his Notes upon *Theodulphus*, [at *Paris* 1646. which are also in *Biblioth. Patrum*, Tom. 14.]

These are very near all the Works of *Florus* which we have extant. He made a great many Collections, reason'd very properly, and writ tolerably well. He pass'd for one of the best Writers in his Time.

Haymo [Aimo] or *Hemmo*, (a) a Monk of *Fulda*, or of *Hersfield*, a Scholar of *Alcuin*, who was chosen Bishop of *Halberstadt* in *Saxony*, in the Year 841. is one of the Authors of this Century, that has writ the most Commentaries. In the Year 847. he assist'd at the Condemnation of *Goteschalvus* in the Council of *Mayence*, and died in the Year 853. He has written Comments upon almost all the Books of the Holy Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testament, collected according to the Custom of this Time out of the Commentaries of the Fathers, whose Expositions he does but copy and abridge. We have those upon the *Psalms* printed at *Paris*, in 1533. [at *Friburg* the same Year.] Those which he compos'd upon the major Prophets, and the twelve minor, printed at *Colen*, in 1573. Seven Books upon the *Apocalypse* at *Paris*, in 1540. and at *Colen*, in 1529. [and 1531.] One Book upon the *Acts*, and seven upon the Canonical Epistles, at *Colen* in 1573. [at *Paris* 1556. and under *Remigius's* Name at *Mentz* 1614.] There is at last a Commentary upon the Epistles of *St. Paul*, which some attribute to *Remigius* of *Auxerre*, which is certainly *Haymo's*.

(a) A Monk of *Fulda*, or *Hersfield*.] Some make him Abbot of *Hersfield*; but *M. Bulteau* believes that he was no more than a Monk of this Monastery, as well because he has no other

It was printed at first at *Rome* in 1598. under the Name of *Remigius* Archbishop of *Rheims*, by the Care of the Jesuit *Villalpandus*, known by his Commentary upon *Ezekiel*, and afterwards reprinted at *Mayence*, in 1614. *Villalpandus* attributed it to *St. Remigius* Archbishop of *Rheims*, who upon the baptized *Lewis*; but all the Critics easily discovered, that this Opinion was not maintainable: For how could *St. Remigius*, that dyed in the Beginning of the sixth Century, cite the Order of *St. Benedict*, *Bede*, the Life of *Casarius* Bishop of *Arles*, &c. His Style and Manner of Writing easily shows, he was of the ninth Century; but yet they don't agree to what Author it ought to be attributed. Some give it to *Remigius d'Auxerre*, others to *Remigius* of *Lyons*, but the greatest Part to *Haymo* of *Halberstadt*; which Name it goes under in many Manuscripts, and in two *Paris* Editions, 1556. and 1608. This last Opinion seems most reasonable; for it is certain, by the Testimony of *Sigebert* and *Tritheimius*, that *Haymo* did write a Commentary upon *St. Paul*: Besides, this is very like his other Commentaries; there is the same Method, the same Manner of Writing, the same Expression, and in the greatest Part of the Manuscripts of it, it bears his Name. Lastly, it was attributed to him 100 Years after his Death, in the Times of *Falbertus* and *Carnatenfis*. On the Contrary, there are but very few Manuscripts that attribute it to *Remigius* of *Auxerre*, and *Sigebert* that writes of this last, has not number'd it amongst his Works. It is therefore more reasonable to attribute it to *Haymo*, than *Remigius*.

We have besides these Commentaries, two Tomes of Homilies upon the *Evangelists*, Printed at *Colen* in 1532. and 1540. and at *Antwerp* in 1559. An Abridgment of the Ecclesiastical History, printed with *Sulpitius Severus*, and with Notes of *Galesinius* at *Colen*, in 1531. and reprinted at the same Place in 1573.

In fine, *Dacherius* hath published in the twelfth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, a small Work concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, which is apparently a Fragment of a Homily of this Bishop's: He there teaches the real and substantial Conversion of the Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of *Jesus Christ*.

Angelomus a Monk of *Luxeuil*, has also written large Commentaries upon the four Books of Kings, taken out of the Works of the Fathers, and upon the *Song of Songs*; they are entitled *Stromates*, because they are woven up of many Passages of divers Fathers: The first is divided into four Books, which he wrote by command of *Drago* or *Drenx* his Abbot; but he did not finish it till after the Abbot's Death, in 855. And the second is dedicated to the Emperor *Lotharius*, before he was deprived of the Empire, which happened in 855. These Commentaries are Allegorical and Mystical; they are printed in the *Biblioth. Patrum* [Tom. 15.] and have been printed separately at *Colen*, in 1530. and at *Rome* in 1665. *Tritheimius* mentions another Treatise of this Author's, bearing the Title Of *Divine Offices*.

Some Time before these Authors, of whom we have been speaking, and at the Beginning of this Century, one *Sedulius* a *Scotman*, writ the like Commentary upon *St. Paul's* Epistles, which are nothing else but Collections out of the Commentaries of other Authors. It is thought that this *Sedulius* was also Author of the like Collections upon *St. Matthew*. [His Collection on *St. Paul's* Epistles is printed at *Basil*, 1528. 1534. and in *Biblioth. Patrum*. Tom. 6.]

We must add to these *Christianus Druthmarus*, a Monk and Priest of *Corbie*, who lived about the End of the ninth Century. He has made a Commentary upon the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, addressed to the Monks of *Seavelo* and *Malmedy*. He tells us in his Preface, that he compos'd it for the Use of the young Monks; because that he observes, after he had expounded to them twice the Gospel of *St. Matthew*, they had forgot what he had taught them. He says, he express'd himself in Terms easie enough to be understood; that he endeavour'd to clear all difficulties, that he kept to the Literal and Historical Sense, because that the Letter is the Ground of other Senses, and that without it they could not be well understood. He promises a Commentary upon the Gospel of *St. John*, for that of *St. Mark*, he refers to one of *Bede*. This Author performs his Design well enough; his Expositions are short, historical, easie, and without Allegories or Tropes. There are also two Expositions of the same Author, upon some Places of *St. Luke* and *St. John*. This Commentary has been printed at *Huguenau*, in the Year 1550. [1530] in the *Biblioth. Patrum*.

Character given him in the Chronicle of *Saxony*, as that *Hui* who was Abbot of *Hersfield* in 831. did not die till 846. when he was succeeded by *Bruvardus*.

This

This Author was called *The Grammarian*, because he was very skillful in the Languages, and understood Greek and Latin admirably well, and always kept to the literal Sense. Lastly, *Remigius*, a Monk of St. German's of Auxerre, was called to Rheims to fix his Studies there, by *Fulgreus* who succeeded *Hincmarus* [in that See, and had lately erected a School at Rheims] in the Year 882. He was reputed to have been very learned in prophane Sciences, says *Siebert*; but yet he employ'd himself more profitably in expounding the Holy Scripture. We have one of his * Commentaries upon the *Psalms*, collected out of those of St. *Ambrose*, St. *Augustine*, *Cassiodore*, and an Exposition of the twelve minor Prophets, printed at Antwerp, in 1545. and in the *Bib. Patrum* [Tom. 16.] *Siebert* makes no Mention of these two Books: Some deprive him of the first, and bestow it upon one *Monegondus*; but *Trithemius* attributes it to *Remigius* of Auxerre. This same Author makes Mention of a Commentary of *Remigius's* upon St. *Matthew*. We have

observed, that the Commentary upon the Epistles of St. *Paul*, which some attribute to *Remigius* of Auxerre, does rather belong to *Haymo* of Halberstadt. Both *Siebert* and *Trithemius* place among his Works, a Commentary on the Song of Songs, which was never printed. But in the *Biblioth. Patrum*, we have the Exposition of the Canon of the Mass, of which the same Author speaks: They also say he wrote a Book of Divine Offices, a Treatise of all the Feasts of the Saints, an Answer to *Gualo* Bishop of Autun, who had proposed two Questions to him; one upon the Contest of St. *Michael* the Archangel, with the Devil about the Body of *Moses*, spoken of in the Epistle of St. *Jude*; and the other upon these Words of God to *Job*, *Lo, the Behemoth that I have made with you*, &c. and some other Treatises. *Trithemius* adds, that he Compos'd a great many learned Books, and amongst the rest, a Commentary upon *Donatus*, and other Ancients. Neither of these Treatises or the foregoing, have been yet Printed, no more than his Sermons.

C H A P. XVI.

The History of the Popes, that enjoy'd the Holy See during the Ninth Century.

LEO III. who had been rais'd to the Holy See, about the End of the foregoing Century, dying in the Year 816. he was succeeded by *Stephen IV.* Soon after his Exaltation he imposed an Oath of Fidelity upon the People of Rome, to be true to *Lewis the Godly*, and then went into France to visit this Emperor, where he was very honourably receiv'd: and after he had obtain'd Liberty for some Prisoners, and a Return for some Persons that were then in Banishment, he returned to Rome, where he dyed a little while after, in the seventh Month of his Pontificate.

Paschal I. *Paschal* the first of that Name, who succeeded him, was rais'd to the See of Rome in the Year 817. He immediately gave Notice of his Elevation to *Lewis the Godly*, according to the Custom of those Times. Having received Letters from *Theodorus Studita*, and other Defenders of Images persecuted in the East; he writ them back a Letter, to comfort them in their Sufferings. There are three Letters which go under his Name, but which are very faulty, and much to be suspected. The first is about a Privilege granted to the Church of *Ravenna*. The second is an Account of the Invention of the Relicks of St. *Cecilia*. By the third he grants the Pall to the Archbishop of *Vienna*. The two first are not worthy of Credit, and the third is doubtful: [They are extant in Tom. 7. of the Councils.]

Eugenius II. *Eugenius II.* succeeded Pope *Paschal* in the Year 824. There goes under his Name a Bull, sent to the Bishops and Lords of the Army of the *Huns*, which does not seem a very authentick Monument. There are also attributed to him some Canons, but without doubt they belong to a Council of *Rheims*, and not to this Pope. There is also a Letter under his Name to *Bernard*, Archbishop of *Vienna*, which has little more to be said for it than the former. [This with another Letter attributed to him, is extant Tom. 7. of the Councils.]

Valentinus, Gregory IV. *Valentinus* who succeeded *Eugenius* in the Year 827. having lived but few Months, *Gregory IV.* was raised to this Dignity, at the Beginning of the following Year. He came into France to favour the Undertakings of the Children of *Lewis the Godly*, against their Father; threatening to excommunicate the Bishops that would not be of his Side. But the Bishops answered him boldly, that if he came to excommunicate them, he should return excommunicated by them. We have spoken of an Extract of a Letter, which this Pope writ upon this Subject, which is to be found amongst *Agobard's* Works. There are also two other Letters of this Pope, one upon the Affair of *Adricus* Bishop of *Mans*, whose Cause he would have had brought before him, and in the mean Time his Title of Bishop to cease: And the other upon the Deposing of *Elbo*, which he disapproves of, and condemns of Violence. [This Pope's Letters are in Tom. 7. of the Councils.]

Sergius II. *Sergius II.* succeeded Pope *Gregory IV.* in the Year 844. We have but one Letter of this Pope's, by which he makes *Drogo* Bishop of *Metz* his Vicar general in the Countries, on the other side of the *Alps*, in Consideration that he was Uncle to the Children of *Lewis the Godly*, and besides was very fit for that Office. He gives him Power to assemble the National Councils of all that Country; to examine the Causes of those that shall appeal to the Holy See, and to prepare those of Abbots and Bishops. He forbids any to appeal to Rome, that have not first had their Cause examined in a Provincial Synod, or in that of the Vicar General; because an Affair may be better understood in a Place where it is transacted, than any where else. This Letter is directed to all the Bishops on the other side the *Alpes*; 'tis written with Vol. II.

a great deal of Weight and worth. [This Letter is printed in Tom. 7. of the Councils, p. 1799.]

Leo IV. *Leo IV.* was chosen Pope, after the Death of *Sergius II.* the 12th. of April, in the Year 847. He governed the Church of Rome eight Years, three Months, and some Days; during this Time he wrote divers Letters, but there are but two of them come to us entire, and it is not very certain they are his.

The first is a short Letter directed to *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troyes*, by which he commands him to consecrate an Abby for *Ademarus* and his Monks, which was to depend upon the Holy See.

The second is sent to the Bishops of *England*, who had consulted him upon many Articles, and particularly about Simoniackal Bishops; he orders, that such should be try'd in a Council. He afterwards gives them a satisfactory Answer to their other Questions: Concerning the first he says, 1. That the Hierarchy consists of Bishops and Clergymen. 2. That every Bishop is to govern his Diocese, by his Priests and other Clergy, and make his Visitations. 3. That Priests ought not to be obliged by them to carry the Eulogies to the Councils. 4. That Charms are a sort of Witchcraft. 5. That no Body ought to marry his Kinswoman. 6. That the Bishops ought to regulate their Judgments, by the Canons of the Councils, and the Decrees of the Popes *Silvester*, *Siricus*, &c. but might also make use of the Authorities of St. *Jerom*, St. *Augustine*, and St. *Isidore*.

We have some Fragments of a Letter of *Leo*, against *Nomenocus* Duke of *Britain*; of another to *Lotharius*, in which he refuses the Pall, to the Bishop of *Autun*; and of a third to *Hincmarus*, concerning the Council of *Soissons*.

Lastly, There is a Discourse attributed to this Pope, directed to the Priests and Bishops, containing a great many Instructions relating to their Ministry and Duty. [All these Letters of Pope *Leo*, are put into the 8th. Tome of the Councils, p. 30.]

Benedict III. of that Name, was chosen in July, 855. after the death of *Leo* the IV. His Election was opposed by a Priest, called *Athanasius*, who through the favour of the Commissioners of the Emperor, possess himself of the See and Palace of Rome; he also put *Benedict* into Prison: But at last, such as espous'd *Athanasius's* Cause, were forc'd to yield, and to depose him themselves, and to acknowledge *Benedict*. This Pope was but two Years and an half in the Papal Seat, and we have but two Letters of his; one to *Hincmarus*, concerning the Council of *Soissons*, and the Privileges of the Church of *Rheims*; and the other to the Bishops of *Charles's* Kingdom, by the which he cites to Rome, *Hubert* Son of *Boson*, who had quitted his Profession of a Clergyman, and liv'd a lewd and irregular Life.

There are also two other Letters attributed to this Pope; one to confirm the Privileges of the Abby of *Corbey*; and another to ratify those of the Abby of St. *Denis*. But since these Writings are doubtful, and particularly the last, we shall insist no longer upon them. These four Letters are printed together in Tom. 8. of the Councils.

Nicholas I. *Nicholas* the first, Son of *Theodorus* a Roman, was ordain'd Subdeacon by Pope *Sergius*, and Deacon by Pope *Leo IV.* He acquired a great Reputation under the Pontificate of *Benedict III.* He was chosen after the Death of this Pope by the Clergy and Grandees of Rome to his See, in the Year 858. and was consecrated in Presence of the Emperor *Lewis*, the 22d. of April. He had at the Beginning of his Pontificate a Difference with *John* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, against whom many had brought Complaints to the Holy See. He cited him three several Times to a Synod of Rome. But this

Of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

Archbishop not appearing, he excommunicated him. *John* upon this had immediate Recourse to the Emperor, who was then at *Pavia*, and afterwards came to *Rome* with some Officers, which that Prince sent to accompany him. The Pope told those Officers, That they ought not to join themselves with one that was excommunicate; and at the same Time cited *John* to the Synod that was to be held in *November*. But instead of obeying, *John* immediately left *Rome*. The Senators of *Ravenna*, and the People of *Æmilia* pray'd the Pope to come himself in Person to *Ravenna* to reform the Disorders that *John* had caused there. He went and restored to the People of *Æmilia* and *Pentapolis* the great Riches that *John* and his Brother had got into their Possession. *John* fled to *Pavia* to beg the Assistance of the Emperor *Lewis*, but this Prince counselled him to submit to the Pope, and to reconcile himself to him. Which he did; and the Pope gave him Absolution from the Heresie of which he cleared himself, and received him again into his Communion. And upon the Complaints of the Bishop and People of *Æmilia*, he order'd him to come every Year to the Synod at *Rome*: To ordain no Bishops but such as were chosen by the Duke, Clergy, and People, and whose Election was first confirm'd by the Holy See. To permit the Bishops of *Æmilia* to come to *Rome* when they pleas'd. To exact nothing of them, and not to seize upon any Revenues, under Pretence that they belong'd to him, till it was plainly determin'd by the Holy See, or Commissioners from it, that they did really belong to him. This Decree of the Pope was approv'd of by the Synod.

This Affair was follow'd by many others of greater Consequence, which *Nicholas* maintain'd with a great Deal of Courage and Vigor. The Principal are the Intrusion of *Phorius*, and the unjust Deposing of *Ignatius*; the Divorce of *Thietberga*; the Deposing of *Rothadus*, and the Conversion of the *Bulgarians*: Which are not necessary to be any farther spoken of here, because I have treated of them in other Places of this Volume. And this is also the Reason that I have but little to say of his Letters, which are near an hundred; because the Course of our History about these Affairs, hath oblig'd us to make an Extract of them upon other Occasions. The first sixteen are a Collection, which he made himself of those, which related to the Case of *Ignatius* and *Phorius*. The rest concern the Affairs of *France*, the Peace between the Kings, the Divorce of *Thietberga*, of *Lotharius*, the Excommunication of *Walrada*, the Pardoning of Count *Baldwin*, the Affair of *Ingletruda* and *Boson*, the Judgment pronounc'd against *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, the Affair of *Ebbó*, the Privileges of some Abbys, the Promotion of *Hiladus* to the Bishoprick of *Cambray*, the Dispute between the Bishop of *Mans* and the Monks of *St. Kallist*, the Pail granted to *Egilb* Archbishop of *Sens*, the Bishopricks of *Brittany*, which the Dukes of that Country had a mind to take away from the Metropolis of *Tours*, and the Objections of the *Greeks* against the Church of *Rome*, about which he consults the Bishops of *France*.

But there is one of these Letters, in which he answers *Rothadus* Archbishop of *Bourges*, about several Points of Discipline, which we cannot pass over in Silence. It contains seven Articles. The first relates to the Ordaining of Priests and Deacons by Suffragans. Some Bishops of *France* depos'd those they had ordained; and others re-ordain'd them. Because, says he, Suffragans were created in Imitation of the Seventy Disciples, who might perform Episcopal Functions. But because the Canons forbid Suffragans to execute these Functions, he orders the Canons for the Future to be observ'd.

The second is upon the Complaint the Archbishop of *Narbonne* made, That the Archbishop of *Bourges* forc'd his Clergy to commence their Differences in his Courts, and be tried by him; and that he dispos'd of several Matters that belong'd to his Diocess, without consulting him about it. *Nicholas* admonish'd the Archbishop of *Bourges* of this, and told him, That his Quality of Primate and Patriarch did not allow him that Privilege. And that he ought to content himself to be Judge of Appeals of Causes which had been tried before by the Archbishop of *Narbonne*. He repeats anew, upon this Occasion, the Canons that constitute the Rights of Patriarchs and Primates.

In the third he declares, That in the Church of *Rome* they never anoint the Hands of those Priests and Deacons that are ordain'd with the Chrysm: Adding, that he never read that it was practis'd.

The fourth permits the Archbishop of *Bourges* to moderate the Penance, and relax something of the Rigour of Canons made against such, as having undertaken a State of Penance, return again to the World.

The fifth is about those that are oblig'd to bring to Confirmation such Children as their Wives have had by a former Husband. He says, That if they have been guilty of the Neglect of it thro' Ignorance, they ought not to be parted from their Wives, but only made to do Penance.

The sixth orders, That such as have kill'd their Wives, unless they have taken them in Adultery, shall be made to undergo the Penance of Homicides.

The seventh intimates, That the Bishops ought to repeat the *Gloria in Excelsis*, on *Holy-Thursd*ay at Mass. But it is not permitted to any to wear the Pall on this Day, unless they have Leave from the Holy See.

Father *Dachorius* in the twelfth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, has publish'd another Canonical Letter of *Nicholas* the first, sent to *Herduicus* Archbishop of *Bejingon*, in which the Pope prescribes the following Rules.

First, he proves by the Canons, That such as have married two Sisters, may not marry any more for the Future.

Secondly, That those that have married their Relations, and are upon that Account divorc'd, cannot marry as long as either of them lives; but that it is not forbidden when one of them dies.

Thirdly, he also believes, That Marriage ought not to be absolutely forbidden to such as have committed the Crime of Sodomy, provided they repent of their Sin, and have left off that curled Habit.

Fourthly, he shews, That the Election of a Bishop by the Clergy and chief Men of the Diocess, ought to stand good.

In the fifth Article he says, That it is forbidden Suffragans, not only to ordain Priests and Deacons, but also to consecrate Churches and confirm Children, which only belongs to the Bishops, as we may observe, not only by the Customs of the Church, but also by the Acts of the Apostles.

The last shews, That a Priest that is once fall'n into, and convict of a foul Crime, can no more be restored to his Function.

There is another Work of *Nicholas* the first, concerning Church Discipline, yet more considerable than the former. 'Tis his Answer to the Questions of the *Bulgarians*, which contains * above 100. Articles.

In the first he says, That the Religion of Jesus Christ consists in Faith and Good Works.

The second is concerning the Spiritual Affinity between God-fathers and their God-children, which hinders their ever marrying together.

The third is about the Ceremonies of Marriage. He says, That after the betrothing, the Priest ought to cause the Persons to come into the Church with their Offerings, and there give them his Benediction and the Veil, which is not to be given in second Marriages. That being gone out of the Church, they should wear Crowns upon their Heads. These are the ordinary and solemn Ceremonies, which, as the *Greeks* say of theirs, need not nevertheless always be observed. That consent, according to the Laws, might suffice; and that if that be wanting, the rest signifies nothing.

The fourth sets down the Fasts which are observed in the Church of *Rome*; 1. Lent; 2. The Fast after Whitsunday; 3. That before the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; 4. That before *Christmas*; 5. The sixth Day of every Week; and 6. All the Vigils or Eves of great Feasts.

In the fifth he says, That the Fast on *Wednesday* is not commanded, but that of *Friday* is.

In the sixth, That it is not forbid to bathe on those Days.

In the seventh and eighth he approves of the Custom of carrying and kissing the Cross, and of the Relicks, in Lent.

In the ninth he extols the Custom of communicating every Day in Lent, provided the Communicant be engaged in no Sin, nor has any mortal Crime lying upon his Conscience.

The tenth is about the Celebration of *Sunday*.

The eleventh sets down the Feasts in which we must forbear working, to assist at Divine Service.

In the twelfth he says it is to be wish'd that Men would on those Days forbear also trying civil and criminal Affairs.

In the thirteenth he excuses himself for not sending them Civil Laws.

In the fourteenth he aggravates the Cruelty which was us'd towards a *Greek*, who had his Ears and Nose cut off for pretending to be a Priest, and baptizing a great many People.

In the fifteenth he says, That such Persons ought not to be re-baptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity.

In the sixteenth he says, That those that did thus abuse this Priest ought to be put to Penance.

In the seventeenth he blames the King for executing the principal Leaders of a Rebellion rais'd against him by the *Bulgarians*, whom he had caus'd to be baptized. And he says that he has committed a great Sin, and particularly in the murdering their Infants who were innocent. But since he did it thro' a violent Zeal for Religion, and a blind Ignorance, he hopes he may obtain Mercy, if he repent.

In the eighteenth he says, That those that have been baptized, and after forsake Christianity, ought to be first admonish'd by them, that held them to the Font; that if they do not reform, they ought to be accus'd to the Church; and that if they refuse to obey the Church, they should be punish'd by the Prince's Authority.

In the nineteenth he says, They may make use of the Rigor of their Laws against those, as would take away the Lives of their Princes. Nevertheless, he exhorts the King to pardon such Offenders. This, and the following Articles relate more to Civil Policy than Church Discipline.

Of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

In the 41st. he forbids forcing Infidels to the Faith, and advises them to avoid communicating with them.

In the 44th. and those that follow, he forbids Hunting, Examining Causes, Playing, Marrying, or Feasting in Lent; and in the 50th. leaves it to the Prudence of the Bishop or Priest, who have the Care of Consciences, to determine after what Manner a Man should live with his Wife during that Time.

In the 51st. he expressly forbids Men to have two Wives at a Time. In the 53^d. he says, That it is permitted to all Believers, to make the Sign of the Cross upon the Table, and to give a Benediction thereupon in the Absence of the Priest. In the 54th. he does not disapprove of the Custom of the *Greeks*, who thro' humility used always to wash their Hands before they went into the Church; but nevertheless, he does not command it. In the 55th. he says, he does not think it needful to force People newly converted to pay their Debts, that they may be received into Communion. In the 56th. he approves of the Custom of ordering Prayers and Fasts for Temporal Necessities, as in a Time of Drought, &c. In the 57th. he rejects the Superstition of the *Greeks*, who would not eat any Beasts kill'd by Eunuchs. In the 58th. he orders, according to the Precept of the Apostle, that Women should have their Heads covered in the Church. The 59th. and 60th. relate to their Habits and the Hours of Eating. In the 61st. he recommends continual Prayer to them. In the 62^d. he forbids them to make use of a certain Stone that they believ'd would heal or cure a Disease. The 63^d. and 64th. shew the Time when it is most proper to abstain from the Use of Marriage. The 65th. commands to receive the Eucharist fasting, and allows those to come to the Communion, who have bled much at the Nose or Mouth; for which he makes Use of the Example of the Woman in the Gospel, who being sick of a Bloody-flux, touched Christ's Garment; which makes it credible, that he doth not debar Women from it that are under the like Inconvenience. In the 66th. he forbids them to enter their Church with their Turbans on their Heads. In the 67th. he forbids the *Bulgarians* to swear by their Sword, or by the Name of any Creature. The 68th. allows Women newly brought to Bed, to enter into the Church. In the 69th. he says, That the solemn Times of administering Baptism are the Feasts of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*; but that it is not necessary to observe this in regard of the People newly converted, no more than in respect of such as are in Danger of Death. The 70th. directs that they ought not to depose a Priest who hath a Wife; and that it is not lawful for Laymen to judge of Priests. The 71st. shews that Priests, how wicked soever they are, cannot defile the Sacraments; and that they may be received from them with Security. The 72^d. is about the Question propounded to him concerning a Patriarch: He says, he cannot answer whether he shall grant them one, till he knows their Number of Christians: That a Bishop may serve their Turn in the mean Time; and that if their Number of Believers encrease, and that there be divers Churches and divers Bishops, he will make Choice of one of them for their Patriarch, or rather Archbishop. In the 73^d. he says, that the Patriarch, Bishop, or Archbishop must not be ordained but by the supreme Bishop; and then he that is ordained by him, having receiv'd the Privilege of Metropolitan from the Holy See, may ordain other Bishops. That after this there would be no more Need of coming to *Rome* for the Ordination of their Archbishop, who then might be ordained by the other Bishops, upon Condition that he doth not execute any Part of his Office till he has received the Pall. The 74th. asserts that Men may pray any where. The 75th. and 76th. That the Bishops that he will send them, shall bring the Rules of Penance which they desired, together with a Missal. In the 77th. he forbids them to have any thing to do with Lots, by putting a Pin into a Book to find out any Thing they are in Suspicion of. The 78th. declares, that Penance ought to be refus'd to none. In the 79th. he forbids superstitious Ligatures made use of to cure Men. The following Articles relate to Peace, Agreements or Bargains, Judgments and Civil Punishments. In the 85th. he forbids forcing Widows to become Nuns. The 88th. says, that it is not lawful to pray for such as dy'd in their Infidelity. The 89th. recommends to them the Custom of offering the First-fruits of the Earth. The 90th. says, that it is lawful to eat Birds which have not been bled in killing them. The 91st. forbids Christians to eat Beasts kill'd or hunted by Infidels. In the 92^d. he declares that they are the proper Patriarchs who govern the Churches founded by the Apostles, which are only *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*. That the Bishops of *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* are also called Patriarchs; but they have not so great Authority as these three. In the 93^d. he declares that of *Alexandria* to be the second Patriarch. In the 94th. he declares the Cheat of the *Greeks*, who said that Chrysin came first from their Country. The 95th. says, that they ought not to be taken from the Church who have fled thither for Sanctuary. In the 96th. he forbids Husbands to be divorced from their Wives, if it be not for Adultery. In

the 97th. he exhorts Masters to pardon their Slaves that have offended them. In the 98th. he is willing that such as kill themselves should be buried, for fear their putrid Bodies should occasion Infection; but he would have no Obligation bellowed upon them, nor any Sacrifice or Prayer offered for them. In the 99th. he permits such to be buried in the Church as have liv'd well. The 100th. approves of the Custom of carrying dead Bodies into their own Countries. In the 101st. he commends Alms. In the 102^d. he forbids doing violence to Pagans to convert them. In the 103^d. he commands them to burn the Books of the *Sarazens*. The 104th. is concerning the validity of Baptism administered by a Jew, who had no Religion. *Nicholas* the first answers, that such ought not to be re-baptized, if he did confer it upon them in the name of the Trinity. In the 105th. he speaks of those that preach'd a Doctrine contrary to that of the Apostles. He answers that they ought not to be heard: But that it doth not belong to the *Bulgarian* Laymen to judge whether the Doctrine be true, or not. In the last he exhorts them to take Instructions from none, but the Church of *Rome*, which always delivers the Truth to such as desire it.

These are the Decisions or Answers of *Nicholas* the first in this Work. This Pope was a great Canonist. He wrote readily and with Authority. He often quoted the Canons and Decretals of the Popes. He maintain'd the Grandeur of his See with vigour, and manag'd the most difficult Matters he was concern'd in with Honour. *M. de Marca* observes, that he had done some Injuries to the Discipline and Liberties of the Church, by maintaining that it was not lawful to assemble a National Synod without the consent of the Pope: In attributing to himself the Appeals of the Clergies Cases determined in National Synods; and also after a Review brought, in citing the Persons and Causes to *Rome* to be there determined anew, instead of appointing Judges on the Places; and affirming, that the Causes of Bishops wholly belong'd to his Cognizance. But these Pretensions have not been acknowledg'd by the Church, and particularly by that of *France*, who have always kept to their Liberties without the least diminution of Respect and Submission due to the Holy See. [These Epistles are all put out in Tome VIII. of the Councils.]

After the death of *Nicholas* the first, which happened the 13th. of November in the Year 867. *Adrian* the second, *Adrian II.* who was about 76 Years of Age, was chosen in his place. He was a *Roman*, the Son of *Talanus*, related to the Popes *Stephen* the fourth and *Sergius* the Younger. *Gregory* the fourth ordained him Priest, and gave him the Title of *St. Mark*. His Liberality gained him a great repute in *Rome*, and he was propos'd to be chosen Pope after the death of *Leo* the fourth, and *Benedict* the third. And after the death of *Nicholas* he obtain'd it both by the Votes of the People, who lov'd him, and by the joynt consent of both Parties of Grandees. *Lewis* the Emperor approved of his Election; and he was ordained the 14th. of December. He was at first suspected not to favour much the Memory of his Predecessor *Nicholas* the first, because he seem'd not so severe towards *Lotharius* and *Waldrada*, as he had been. But he freed himself from this suspicion, and reunited those to him that before had forsaken his Interest upon this account.

The beginning of his Pontificate was disturb'd by the Invasion of *Rome*, which the Duke of *Spoleto* seiz'd on, and harass'd with Robberies and Plundering of his Soldiers. But *Rome* was deliver'd both by the Authority of the Emperor, who depriv'd the Duke of *Spoleto* of his own Dominions, and the Thunderbolts of Excommunication which the Pope sent out against these Robbers. A Peace was no sooner granted to the Church of *Rome*, but the Affair of *Photius* was brought before Pope *Adrian*. The Emperor *Basilus* having restored *Ignatius*, sent some of his Officers to *Rome* to accompany the Deputies of *Ignatius* and *Photius*. Those of *Photius*'s side were drown'd for the most part, and there appear'd in his behalf but one inconsiderable Monk call'd *Methodius*, who durst not maintain his Cause, and who suffer'd himself to be cited thrice, and was at last condemn'd for Non-appearance. But the Officer of the great Emperor, and *John* Metropolitan of *Casaria* in *Cappadocia*, having presented to Pope *Adrian* the Transactions of the pretended Council which *Photius* had assembled against Pope *Nicholas* the first, he caus'd them to be examined and condemn'd in a Council which pronounced an Anathema against *Photius*, and had the Book burnt which he wrote against Pope *Nicholas*. After this *Adrian* sent Legates to *Constantinople* to assist in his name at the eighth General Council. They had at first all the satisfaction they could wish, but after the Council, they enter'd upon the Affair of *Bulgaria*, and after it was debated in their hearing, judg'd that it ought to be subject to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, which troubled the Legates extremely. Wherefore having protested against, and declared this Judgment null, they immediately left the City dissatisfied. And being but very meanly accompanied, they fell into the hands of the

Of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

Archbishop not appearing, he excommunicated him. *John* upon this had immediate Recourse to the Emperor, who was then at *Pavia*, and afterwards came to *Rome* with some Officers, which that Prince sent to accompany him. The Pope told those Officers, That they ought not to join themselves with one that was excommunicate; and at the same Time cited *John* to the Synod that was to be held in *November*. But instead of obeying, *John* immediately left *Rome*. The Senators of *Ravenna*, and the People of *Æmilia* pray'd the Pope to come himself in Person to *Ravenna* to reform the Disorders that *John* had caused there. He went and restored to the People of *Æmilia* and *Pentapolis* the great Riches that *John* and his Brother had got into their Possession. *John* fled to *Pavia* to beg the Assistance of the Emperor *Lewis*, but this Prince counselled him to submit to the Pope, and to reconcile himself to him. Which he did; and the Pope gave him Absolution from the Heresie of which he cleared himself, and received him again into his Communion. And upon the Complaints of the Bishop and People of *Æmilia*, he order'd him to come every Year to the Synod at *Rome*: To ordain no Bishops but such as were chosen by the Duke, Clergy, and People, and whose Election was first confirm'd by the Holy See. To permit the Bishops of *Æmilia* to come to *Rome* when they pleas'd. To exact nothing of them, and not to seize upon any Revenues, under Pretence that they belong'd to him, till it was plainly determin'd by the Holy See, or Commissioners from it, that they did really belong to him. This Decree of the Pope was approv'd of by the Synod.

This Affair was follow'd by many others of greater Consequence, which *Nicholas* maintain'd with a great Deal of Courage and Vigor. The Principal are the Intrusion of *Phorius*, and the unjust Deposing of *Ignatius*; the Divorce of *Thietberga*; the Deposing of *Rothadus*, and the Conversion of the *Bulgarians*: Which are not necessary to be any farther spoken of here, because I have treated of them in other Places of this Volume. And this is also the Reason that I have but little to say of his Letters, which are near an hundred; because the Course of our History about these Affairs, hath oblig'd us to make an Extract of them upon other Occasions. The first sixteen are a Collection, which he made himself of those, which related to the Case of *Ignatius* and *Phorius*. The rest concern the Affairs of *France*, the Peace between the Kings, the Divorce of *Thietberga*, of *Lotharius*, the Excommunication of *Walarada*, the Pardoning of Count *Baldwin*, the Affair of *Ingletruda* and *Boson*, the Judgment pronounc'd against *Rothadus* Bishop of *Soissons*, the Affair of *Ebbó*, the Privileges of some Abbys, the Promotion of *Hildacius* to the Bishoprick of *Cambray*, the Dispute between the Bishop of *Mans* and the Monks of *St. Kallist*, the Pail granted to *Egilb* Archbishop of *Sens*, the Bishopricks of *Brittany*, which the Dukes of that Country had a mind to take away from the Metropolis of *Tours*, and the Objections of the *Greeks* against the Church of *Rome*, about which he consults the Bishops of *France*.

But there is one of these Letters, in which he answers *Rothadus* Archbishop of *Bourges*, about several Points of Discipline, which we cannot pass over in Silence. It contains seven Articles. The first relates to the Ordaining of Priests and Deacons by Suffragans. Some Bishops of *France* depos'd those they had ordained; and others re-ordain'd them. Because, says he, Suffragans were created in Imitation of the Seventy Disciples, who might perform Episcopal Functions. But because the Canons forbid Suffragans to execute these Functions, he orders the Canons for the Future to be observ'd.

The second is upon the Complaint the Archbishop of *Narbonne* made, That the Archbishop of *Bourges* forc'd his Clergy to commence their Differences in his Courts, and be tried by him; and that he dispos'd of several Matters that belong'd to his Diocess, without consulting him about it. *Nicholas* admonish'd the Archbishop of *Bourges* of this, and told him, That his Quality of Primate and Patriarch did not allow him that Privilege. And that he ought to content himself to be Judge of Appeals of Causes which had been tried before by the Archbishop of *Narbonne*. He repeats anew, upon this Occasion, the Canons that constitute the Rights of Patriarchs and Primates.

In the third he declares, That in the Church of *Rome* they never anoint the Hands of those Priests and Deacons that are ordain'd with the Chrysm: Adding, that he never read that it was practis'd.

The fourth permits the Archbishop of *Bourges* to moderate the Penance, and relax something of the Rigour of Canons made against such, as having undertaken a State of Penance, return again to the World.

The fifth is about those that are oblig'd to bring to Confirmation such Children as their Wives have had by a former Husband. He says, That if they have been guilty of the Neglect of it thro' Ignorance, they ought not to be parted from their Wives, but only made to do Penance.

The sixth orders, That such as have kill'd their Wives, unless they have taken them in Adultery, shall be made to undergo the Penance of Homicides.

The seventh intimates, That the Bishops ought to repeat the *Gloria in Excelsis*, on *Holy-Thurs*day at Mass. But it is not permitted to any to wear the Pall on this Day, unless they have Leave from the Holy See.

Father *Dachorius* in the twelfth Tome of his *Spicilegium*, has publish'd another Canonical Letter of *Nicholas* the first, sent to *Herduicus* Archbishop of *Bejingon*, in which the Pope prescribes the following Rules.

First, he proves by the Canons, That such as have married two Sisters, may not marry any more for the Future.

Secondly, That those that have married their Relations, and are upon that Account divorc'd, cannot marry as long as either of them lives; but that it is not forbidden when one of them dies.

Thirdly, he also believes, That Marriage ought not to be absolutely forbidden to such as have committed the Crime of Sodomy, provided they repent of their Sin, and have left off that curled Habit.

Fourthly, he shews, That the Election of a Bishop by the Clergy and chief Men of the Diocess, ought to stand good.

In the fifth Article he says, That it is forbidden Suffragans, not only to ordain Priests and Deacons, but also to consecrate Churches and confirm Children, which only belongs to the Bishops, as we may observe, not only by the Customs of the Church, but also by the Acts of the Apostles.

The last shews, That a Priest that is once fall'n into, and convict of a foul Crime, can no more be restored to his Function.

There is another Work of *Nicholas* the first, concerning Church Discipline, yet more considerable than the former. 'Tis his Answer to the Questions of the *Bulgarians*, which contains * above 100. Articles.

In the first he says, That the Religion of Jesus Christ consists in Faith and Good Works.

The second is concerning the Spiritual Affinity between God-fathers and their God-children, which hinders their ever marrying together.

The third is about the Ceremonies of Marriage. He says, That after the betrothing, the Priest ought to cause the Persons to come into the Church with their Offerings, and there give them his Benediction and the Veil, which is not to be given in second Marriages. That being gone out of the Church, they should wear Crowns upon their Heads. These are the ordinary and solemn Ceremonies, which, as the *Greeks* say of theirs, need not nevertheless always be observed. That consent, according to the Laws, might suffice; and that if that be wanting, the rest signifies nothing.

The fourth sets down the Fasts which are observed in the Church of *Rome*; 1. Lent; 2. The Fast after Whitsunday; 3. That before the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin; 4. That before *Christmas*; 5. The sixth Day of every Week; and 6. All the Vigils or Eves of great Feasts.

In the fifth he says, That the Fast on *Wednesday* is not commanded, but that of *Friday* is.

In the sixth, That it is not forbid to bathe on those Days.

In the seventh and eighth he approves of the Custom of carrying and kissing the Cross, and of the Relicks, in Lent.

In the ninth he extols the Custom of communicating every Day in Lent, provided the Communicant be engaged in no Sin, nor has any mortal Crime lying upon his Conscience.

The tenth is about the Celebration of *Sunday*.

The eleventh sets down the Feasts in which we must forbear working, to assist at Divine Service.

In the twelfth he says it is to be wish'd that Men would on those Days forbear also trying civil and criminal Affairs.

In the thirteenth he excuses himself for not sending them Civil Laws.

In the fourteenth he aggravates the Cruelty which was us'd towards a *Greek*, who had his Ears and Nose cut off for pretending to be a Priest, and baptizing a great many People.

In the fifteenth he says, That such Persons ought not to be re-baptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity.

In the sixteenth he says, That those that did thus abuse this Priest ought to be put to Penance.

In the seventeenth he blames the King for executing the principal Leaders of a Rebellion rais'd against him by the *Bulgarians*, whom he had caus'd to be baptized. And he says that he has committed a great Sin, and particularly in the murdering their Infants who were innocent. But since he did it thro' a violent Zeal for Religion, and a blind Ignorance, he hopes he may obtain Mercy, if he repent.

In the eighteenth he says, That those that have been baptized, and after forsake Christianity, ought to be first admonish'd by them, that held them to the Font; that if they do not reform, they ought to be accus'd to the Church; and that if they refuse to obey the Church, they should be punish'd by the Prince's Authority.

In the nineteenth he says, They may make use of the Rigor of their Laws against those, as would take away the Lives of their Princes. Nevertheless, he exhorts the King to pardon such Offenders. This, and the following Articles relate more to Civil Policy than Church Discipline.

of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

In the 41st. he forbids forcing Infidels to the Faith, and advises them to avoid communicating with them.

In the 44th. and those that follow, he forbids Hunting, Examining Causes, Playing, Marrying, or Feasting in Lent; and in the 50th. leaves it to the Prudence of the Bishop or Priest, who have the Care of Consciences, to determine after what Manner a Man should live with his Wife during that Time.

In the 51st. he expressly forbids Men to have two Wives at a Time. In the 53^d. he says, That it is permitted to all Believers, to make the Sign of the Cross upon the Table, and to give a Benediction thereupon in the Absence of the Priest. In the 54th. he does not disapprove of the Custom of the *Greeks*, who thro' humility used always to wash their Hands before they went into the Church; but nevertheless, he does not command it. In the 55th. he says, he does not think it needful to force People newly converted to pay their Debts, that they may be received into Communion. In the 56th. he approves of the Custom of ordering Prayers and Fasts for Temporal Necessities, as in a Time of Drought, &c. In the 57th. he rejects the Superstition of the *Greeks*, who would not eat any Beasts kill'd by Eunuchs. In the 58th. he orders, according to the Precept of the Apostle, that Women should have their Heads covered in the Church. The 59th. and 60th. relate to their Habits and the Hours of Eating. In the 61st. he recommends continual Prayer to them. In the 62^d. he forbids them to make use of a certain Stone that they believ'd would heal or cure a Disease. The 63^d. and 64th. shew the Time when it is most proper to abstain from the Use of Marriage. The 65th. commands to receive the Eucharist fasting, and allows those to come to the Communion, who have bled much at the Nose or Mouth; for which he makes Use of the Example of the Woman in the Gospel, who being sick of a Bloody-flux, touched Christ's Garment; which makes it credible, that he doth not debar Women from it that are under the like Inconvenience. In the 66th. he forbids them to enter their Church with their Turbans on their Heads. In the 67th. he forbids the *Bulgarians* to swear by their Sword, or by the Name of any Creature. The 68th. allows Women newly brought to Bed, to enter into the Church. In the 69th. he says, That the solemn Times of administering Baptism are the Feasts of *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*; but that it is not necessary to observe this in regard of the People newly converted, no more than in respect of such as are in Danger of Death. The 70th. directs that they ought not to depose a Priest who hath a Wife; and that it is not lawful for Laymen to judge of Priests. The 71st. shews that Priests, how wicked soever they are, cannot defile the Sacraments; and that they may be received from them with Security. The 72^d. is about the Question propounded to him concerning a Patriarch: He says, he cannot answer whether he shall grant them one, till he knows their Number of Christians: That a Bishop may serve their Turn in the mean Time; and that if their Number of Believers encrease, and that there be divers Churches and divers Bishops, he will make Choice of one of them for their Patriarch, or rather Archbishop. In the 73^d. he says, that the Patriarch, Bishop, or Archbishop must not be ordained but by the supreme Bishop; and then he that is ordained by him, having receiv'd the Privilege of Metropolitan from the Holy See, may ordain other Bishops. That after this there would be no more Need of coming to *Rome* for the Ordination of their Archbishop, who then might be ordained by the other Bishops, upon Condition that he doth not execute any Part of his Office till he has received the Pall. The 74th. asserts that Men may pray any where. The 75th. and 76th. That the Bishops that he will send them, shall bring the Rules of Penance which they desired, together with a Missal. In the 77th. he forbids them to have any thing to do with Lots, by putting a Pin into a Book to find out any Thing they are in Suspicion of. The 78th. declares, that Penance ought to be refus'd to none. In the 79th. he forbids superstitious Ligatures made use of to cure Men. The following Articles relate to Peace, Agreements or Bargains, Judgments and Civil Punishments. In the 87th. he forbids forcing Widows to become Nuns. The 88th. says, that it is not lawful to pray for such as dy'd in their Infidelity. The 89th. recommends to them the Custom of offering the First-fruits of the Earth. The 90th. says, that it is lawful to eat Birds which have not been bled in killing them. The 91st. forbids Christians to eat Beasts kill'd or hunted by Infidels. In the 92^d. he declares that they are the proper Patriarchs who govern the Churches founded by the Apostles, which are only *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*. That the Bishops of *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* are also called Patriarchs; but they have not so great Authority as these three. In the 93^d. he declares that of *Alexandria* to be the second Patriarch. In the 94th. he declares the Cheat of the *Greeks*, who said that Chrysim came first from their Country. The 95th. says, that they ought not to be taken from the Church who have fled thither for Sanctuary. In the 96th. he forbids Husbands to be divorced from their Wives, if it be not for Adultery. In

the 97th. he exhorts Masters to pardon their Slaves that have offended them. In the 98th. he is willing that such as kill themselves should be buried, for fear their putrid Bodies should occasion Intestition; but he would have no Obligation belov'd upon them, nor any Sacrifice or Prayer offer'd for them. In the 99th. he permits such to be buried in the Church as have liv'd well. The 100th. approves of the Custom of carrying dead Bodies into their own Countries. In the 101st. he commends Alms. In the 102^d. he forbids doing violence to Pagans to convert them. In the 103^d. he commands them to burn the Books of the *Sarazens*. The 104th. is concerning the validity of Baptism administered by a Jew, who had no Religion. *Nicholas* the first answers, that such ought not to be re-baptized, if he did confer it upon them in the name of the Trinity. In the 105th. he speaks of those that preach'd a Doctrine contrary to that of the Apostles. He answers that they ought not to be heard: But that it doth not belong to the *Bulgarian* Lay-men to judge whether the Doctrine be true, or not. In the last he exhorts them to take Instructions from none but the Church of *Rome*, which always delivers the Truth to such as desire it.

These are the Decisions or Answers of *Nicholas* the first in this Work. This Pope was a great Canonist. He wrote readily and with Authority. He often quoted the Canons and Decretals of the Popes. He maintain'd the Grandeur of his See with vigour, and manag'd the most difficult Matters he was concern'd in with Honour. *M. de Marca* observes, that he had done some Injuries to the Discipline and Liberties of the Church, by maintaining that it was not lawful to assemble a National Synod without the consent of the Pope: In attributing to himself the Appeals of the Clergies Cases determined in National Synods; and also after a Review brought, in citing the Persons and Causes to *Rome* to be there determined anew, instead of appointing Judges on the Places; and affirming, that the Causes of Bishops wholly belong'd to his Cognizance. But these Pretensions have not been acknowledg'd by the Church, and particularly by that of *France*, who have always kept to their Liberties without the least diminution of Respect and Submission due to the Holy See. [These Epistles are all put out in Tome VIII. of the Councils.]

After the death of *Nicholas* the first, which happened the 13th. of November in the Year 867. *Adrian* the second, *Adrian* II. who was about 76 Years of Age, was chosen in his place. He was a *Roman*, the Son of *Talanus*, related to the Popes *Stephen* the fourth and *Sergius* the Younger. *Gregory* the fourth ordained him Priest, and gave him the Title of *St. Mark*. His Liberality gained him a great repute in *Rome*, and he was propos'd to be chosen Pope after the death of *Leo* the fourth, and *Benedict* the third. And after the death of *Nicholas* he obtain'd it both by the Votes of the People, who lov'd him, and by the joynt consent of both Parties of *Grandeas*. *Lewis* the Emperor approved of his Election; and he was ordained the 14th. of December. He was at first suspected not to favour much the Memory of his Predecessor *Nicholas* the first, because he seem'd not so severe towards *Lotharius* and *Waldrada*, as he had been. But he freed himself from this suspicion, and reunited those to him that before had forsaken his Interest upon this account.

The beginning of his Pontificate was disturb'd by the Invasion of *Rome*, which the Duke of *Spoleto* seiz'd on, and harass'd with Robberies and Plundering of his Soldiers. But *Rome* was deliver'd both by the Authority of the Emperor, who depriv'd the Duke of *Spoleto* of his own Dominions, and the Thunderbolts of Excommunication which the Pope sent out against these Robbers. A Peace was no sooner granted to the Church of *Rome*, but the Affair of *Photius* was brought before Pope *Adrian*. The Emperor *Basilus* having restored *Ignatius*, sent some of his Officers to *Rome* to accompany the Deputies of *Ignatius* and *Photius*. Those of *Photius*'s side were drown'd for the most part, and there appear'd in his behalf but one inconsiderable Monk call'd *Methodius*, who durst not maintain his Cause, and who suffer'd himself to be cited thrice, and was at last condemn'd for Non-appearance. But the Officer of the great Emperor, and *John* Metropolitan of *Casaria* in *Cappadocia*, having presented to Pope *Adrian* the Transactions of the pretended Council which *Photius* had assembled against Pope *Nicholas* the first, he caus'd them to be examined and condemn'd in a Council which pronounced an Anathema against *Photius*, and had the Book burnt which he wrote against Pope *Nicholas*. After this *Adrian* sent Legates to *Constantinople* to assist in his name at the eighth General Council. They had at first all the satisfaction they could wish, but after the Council, they enter'd upon the Affair of *Bulgaria*, and after it was debated in their hearing, judg'd that it ought to be subject to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, which troubled the Legates extremely. Wherefore having protested against, and declared this Judgment null, they immediately left the City dissatisfied. And being but very meanly accompanied, they fell into the hands of the

Of the Popes during the 9th Century. *Slavonians*, who robbed them, and took them Prisoners. They soon after made an escape, and came to *Rome* at the end of the Year 870.

There are five Letters of this Pope concerning the Affair of *Ignatius* and *Photius* in the Version of the Acts of the eighth Council done by *Anastasius*. The three which follow, relate to the Affairs of *France*, and the Churches of *Brittany*, to *Lotharins* and *Weldrada*, *Athardus*, *Wulfadus*, and the other Clergymen ordained by *Ebbo*. To the Kingdom of *Lotharius*, on which *Charles* the Bald seiz'd after his death, and which *Adrian* would have had been left to *Lewis* the Emperor. To the pretended Privileges of *Carolan*, and to the Quarrel of *Hincmarus* Bishop of *Laon*, with his Uncle. It is not necessary to give any Extracts of these Letters in particular, having spoken of them particularly elsewhere. *Adrian* dyed the first of *November* in the Year 872. He was naturally good and well temper'd, zealous for Peace, and for the welfare of the Catholic Church. His Letters are written in a Style mixt with Gravity and Modesty, Zeal and Humility; he maintaining in every part of them his Authority, without Affectation or Contempt of any Body. He behaves himself towards those he had Business with, according to the Rules of Honesty and Charity; not flattering them by a base Complaisance, or offending them by high Words, nor enraging them by his extraordinary Claims.

John the VIII. was Archdeacon of *Rome*, when he was rais'd to the Holy See; it was in *December* 872. that he came to this Dignity, at a time when all *Italy* began to be very much molested by the inroads of Barbarians, and divisions between the Dukes and Lords. He was obliged to make a Treaty with the *Sarazens*, to hinder their Invasions. After the death of the Emperor *Lewis* the II. he set the Imperial Crown upon the Head of *Charles* the Bald, in the Year 875 and supported himself by his Protection, as long as this Prince lived: But having a mind after his Death to let the Empire fall into the Hands of his Son, he was opposed in his design by the Lords of *Rome*, and by *Lambert* Duke of *Spoletto*, who seiz'd both upon that City and the Pope in it. But he escaping some time after, fled into *France*, where he held the Council of *Troies*: After this, returning into *Italy* with some succours, he drove out the Barbarians, and to procure himself a quiet Life, crowned *Charles* the Gross Emperor, in the Year 880. and dyed at the beginning of the Year 882. He has writ many Letters concerning the Ecclesiastical and Civil Affairs of his time.

The first is directed to Count *Bafon*; he thanks him for the good Service he had done his Legates with *Charles* the Emperor, and acquaints him, that he expected those Succours from that Prince with a great deal of Impatience, which he promised him against the *Sarazens*.

The second to King *Lewis*, is about differences between that Prince and the Emperor *Charles* the Bald: He tells him, that he cannot hope to make them Friends, till he has heard them both, and exhorts him in the mean time to think of a Peace.

In the 3d. he advises *Jeffrey* Prince of *Salern*, that he has received Power from the Emperor to conclude and swear the Treaty made with him, and that he will shortly give him a Visit upon that Occasion.

In the 4th. sent to the Clergy and faithful of the Church of *Valva*, he condemns a certain Person, who would have seized upon that Church, during the life of *Arnoldus*, who was the Bishop of it. He commends them for not being willing to receive him; he forbids them to do it, and threatens them with Excommunication if they should, as also him that undertook to settle him, if he persisted in it.

In the 5th. he commands him that he write to--- which it may be was the Bishop of *Naples*, to separate himself from the Duke of *Naples*, who would not submit to the Holy See, and threatens him with Excommunication, if he does not do it.

In the 6th. he orders his two Legates, which he had at the Emperor's Court at *Pavia*, to return immediately.

In the 7th. he complains of *Boson's* retaining his Legates, and begs assistance of him against the *Sarazens*, to prevent the Believing of *Rome*, which they threaten'd.

The 8th. is written to *Charles* the Bald; in it he allows of the Translation of *Frotarius*, from the Archbishoprick of *Bourdeaux* to that of *Bourges*, upon the Testimony and Remonstrances of the Bishops of that Province, having delayed to grant it till he was acquainted with their Sentiments; as he observes in that Letter.

The 9th. is directed to *Landulphus* Bishop of *Capua*, to whom he sends word, that the Legates whom he had dispatched to the Emperor, had obtained of him, a Confirmation of all the Privileges anciently belonging to the Church of *Rome*, and particularly a Power to conclude such a Treaty, as he himself should think best, concerning the Territory of *Capua*. He informs this Bishop, that he design'd to be in that City shortly, that so he might make preparations to receive him.

In the 10th. he writes to *Adelard* Bishop of *Verona*, to come to *Rome* in *December*, to assist at the Council which

was to be held there; and threatens him with Excommunication in case of a failure.

In the 11th. he desires the Emperor to pardon *Emmenius*, and take him into favour, altho' he owns him to have been justly condemned.

In the 12th. he begs of him to Pardon a Man that had killed another, and who was come to *Rome ad limina Apostolorum*, to expiate his Crime.

The 13th. is directed to the People of *Bourges*, whom he exhorts to receive *Frotarius* for their Archbishop, by reason of the desolation of the Province of *Bourdeaux*, because the Pagans having cruelly ravaged it, he was now become unserviceable in his first Diocels. In the following Letter, he commands the Bishops of that Province to acknowledge him.

In the 15th. he orders the Bishop of *Chartres*, to restore to his Goods and Offices, the Murderer of whom mention is made in the twelfth Letter, who had been at *Rome ad limina*, to make Atonement for his fault.

The 16th. and the four following, are about an Affair wherein *Peter* Archbishop of *Grado* was concern'd. It seems two of his Suffragan Bishops had revolted from him; and one *Dominicus* Abbot of the Monastery of *Altino*, had got himself to be elected Bishop of *Toricelli* in spite of him. The Archbishop of *Grado* having brought this Affair to *Rome*, the Pope cites both these Bishops, and the Bishops Elect, to make their Appearance at the Council which he held there; but they failing to obey the first Citation, he was forced to threaten them with Excommunication if they did not come in Person, to a Council which was to meet in *February*. Then he wrote to two of the neighbouring Bishops, to see this Sentence put in Execution, in case they did not obey; to the Duke of *Venice*, to send them to him; to two Bishops called *Felix* and *Peter*, that he interdicted them, till such time as they came to his Synod; and that if they fail'd of coming thither, he would certainly Excommunicate them. He blames *Dominicus* for his Carriage, and Summons him likewise to his Synod under pain of Excommunication; and he returns his thanks to the Duke of *Venice* for his good inclinations to the Holy See; requesting him to cause those Bishops to repair to the Synod which was to be celebrated in *February*. He directed these Letters to a certain Bishop, whom he desires to distribute the rest, to those Persons to whom they belong'd, as it appears by the twenty fifth Letter, which is address'd to that Bishop.

In the 21st. he desires help of the Emperor *Charles*, against the Insults of the *Sarazens*; representing to him, the terrible Devastations they made among the Christians.

The 22d. is directed to Count *Lambert*, whom he severely reproves for not hindering the violent Oppressions of some of his Subjects, and threatens to Excommunicate him if he did not take care to regulate these disorders for the future.

In the 23d. he thanks the Emperor *Charles* the Bald, for the kind Reception he gave the Legates of the Holy See; as also, because he sent *Ansegisus* and *Adalgarius* to *Rome*, with Commissioners to repress the Insolence of those Persons that were troublesome to the Holy See. He informs him, that they could not be punished according to their deserts, because they were fled to a certain Marquess, and some great Lords, who took them into Protection: he prays the Emperor to find them out, and to Condemn them to Banishment; and humbly entreats him, not to suffer them in his Kingdom. In the following Letter he complains of the Conduct of *Ansegisus*, whom he accuses of maintaining a secret Correspondence with Count *Lambert*. He commends the Fidelity of *Adalgarius*, upon whom he had bestowed a Pall, by way of Recompense.

The greatest part of the following Letters relate to the Wrongs which the Holy See suffered by the *Sarazens* and other Enemies of the Church; against all which he begs the Assistance of *Charles* the Emperor: And exhorts the Bishops and Princes of *Italy*, to break the Treaties made with them; and animates them to declare War against them.

The 34th. Letter is an answer to the Bishop *Ansbert*, who had consulted him about the Promotions of Bishops and Abbots. He sends him word, that he must follow as much as he can the Directions of the Canons; nevertheless, he thinks it convenient, he should wait for the coming of the Emperor, that he may act according to his Will and Pleasure. He says in particular, as to those Persons he had been consulted about, that an Exile may be favoured, without doing any thing contrary to the Canons. That with Permission of the Prince, the Abbot that was put out of a Royal Monastery, might be re-established, if he hath never been convicted of any Crime: And that a Murderer, or any Accomplice in such a Crime, ought to be deprived of all Spiritual Authority.

The 37th. is a Letter about the Translation of *Frotarius* Archbishop of *Bourdeaux*, to the Archbishoprick of *Bourges*.

In the 42d. he exhorts King *Charles* the Gross to restore the Revenues he had taken from a Nunnery at *Bresse*, and threatens him with Excommunication if he does not do it within sixty days.

of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

Of the
Popes dur-
ing the 9th
Century.

In the 47th. he acquaints the Emperor *Charles the Bald*, that he had excommunicated *Adelard Bishop of Verona*, because he had seized upon the Monastery of *Nonantula*. He sends the same thing to the Archbishops of *Ravenna*, *Milan*, and *Aquileia*, in the following Letter: and in the forty ninth to the Clergy of *Verona*.

By the 53d. he commands the Archbishop of *Milan*, and the Bishop of *Bresse*, to meet at the General Synod of the Bishops of *Italy*, which was to be held at *Ravenna* in *June*.

In the 55th. he cites *Vitus Duke of Venice*, and the Bishops of his Country to it. By the following Letter he commands the same thing to be done by the Bishops *Peter* and *Leo*.

In the 57th. he requires the Archbishop of *Ravenna* and his Suffragans, to be present at the General Synod of the Bishops of *Italy*, which was to be held at *Ravenna*.

The 58th. is written to the Patriarch of *Aquileia*, to end his Affair in this Synod.

By the 59th. he acquaints the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, that this Synod was prorogued to the nineteenth of *July*; and he signifies to him in the following Letter, that he has summoned thither all the Bishops of *Italy*, and especially those of *Venice*. The foregoing Letters are dated on the tenth Indiction, that is to say, that they were written between *September 876*. and the same Month in *877*. The following Letters are of the eleventh Indiction.

In the 62d. he sent a Man-slayer to his Bishop, that had been enjoyn'd Penance, and who was come to *Rome*; but he nevertheless exhorts and intreats this Bishop, to mitigate the rigour of his Penance.

The 63d. is address'd to *Carloman*. He acquaints him with his concern for the Death of *Charles the Emperor*, exhorts him to Protect the Church of *Rome*, promises to send him Legates very speedily, grants him the Pall for *Theodemarus* the Archbishop, and desires him to secure him in the possession and enjoyment of the Revenues, which the Church of *Rome* has in *Bavaria*.

The 65th. is written to the English Archbishop, where after he hath commended his Zeal for the Holy See, and exhorted him to discharge his Duty with Constancy, he warns him not to suffer Husbands to forsake their Wives and Marry others. He confirms the Privileges granted by *St. Gregory* to the Bishops of his See.

In the 66th. Letter, he thanks *Athanasius Bishop of Naples*, for excommunicating his Brother *Sergius* who was an Enemy to the Church. He desires him to continue his Labour and Vigilance for his Church, and recommends to him the Deacon *Peter*. In the following one, he commends the *Neapolitans* for driving out *Sergius*, and giving the Government of their City to the Bishop his Brother.

By the 69th. he sends to *Landolphus Bishop of Capua*, to joyn with the Bishop of *Naples* in the defence of the Church of *Rome*, and requires him to observe the Treaty made with the *Amalphytans*.

In the 70th. He reproves the Bishop of *Ambrun*, for ordaining another Bishop of *Venice* than him, that had been chosen by the Clergy and People, and whose Election had been confirmed by the consent of *Charles the Emperor*. He enjoins him to come to *Rome*, together with him that was elected, and him that had been ordained.

The 68th. 72d. and 73d. are Letters written to *Lambert Duke of Spoleto*, an Enemy to *Rome*, to prevent his acting those Hostilities, which he intended against it.

The 75th. and the six Letters following, are written about the Affairs of *Bulgaria* to that King, to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and the Greek Emperor.

The following Letters are written against *Lambert Duke of Spoleto*, who had invaded the Territories of the Holy See, and being posselt of the City of *Rome*, had placed a Garrison in it, abused the Bishops and Priests, and hindered them from performing Divine Service in *St. Peter's Church*.

These outrages obliged the Pope to retire into *France*, to implore aid of *Charles*, of *Carloman*, *Lewis the Stammerer*, of *Engelberga*, and *Berengarius*, as it appears by these Letters.

In the 91st. he acquaints the Empress *Engelberga*, that he will compose the Service for the Anniversary of the Emperor *Lewis* her Husband, as she had desired him: He Con-jures her to continue her care of the Affairs of the Holy See, and to act so, that he may return as soon as possible to *Rome*; he informs her also, that he will hold a Council at *Troyes* the first day of *August*.

In the following Letter he tells her, that he is come to *Arles*, and that he hath met *Boson* and *Hermengarda*, whom he wishes preferred to some higher Dignities, that they might be more able to defend the *Roman Church*.

He Exhorts the Empress to favour him in the design he hath for them, and to write to the Archbishop of *Ravenna* to pray for him, and to send Legates to *Rome* to comfort his faithful Friends.

By Letter the 93d. he makes the Archbishop of *Arles* his Vicar in *France*, yet without prejudice to the Rights of the Metropolitans, for which end he gives him the Pall; and Commands the Bishops that are obliged to go out of

their Provinces, not to do it without his Consent; and if there should happen any Disputes concerning the Faith, or about other matters of any difficulty among the Bishops, he requires them, after they have given him an account of it, to decide it with twelve Bishops which he shall assemble, provided that if it cannot be decided by these Judges, they shall content themselves with having fully instructed him, and refer the matter to the Holy See.

He Complains it is a great disorder, that the Metropolitans of *France* Consecrate Bishops, before they have received the Pall of the Holy See; he desires this Abuse may not be allowed to become Customary.

The Letter 94th. is to the same Person, and on the same Subject; 'tis a forged piece, composed of part of *St. Gregorie's Letter*, and part of the foregoing.

The 95th. is a Copy of one of *St. Gregorie's Letters*.

By Letter 96th he invites *Isaac Bishop of Langres* to the Synod to be held at *Troyes*.

By the 97th. he Excommunicates those that had taken his Horses and Baggage at *Châlons*, unless they return them in three days, and passes the same Sentence against *Adurardus* the Priest, whose Servants had taken a Silver Plate out of the Church of *Rome*.

By the following Letters, he invites and cites the Metropolitans and Bishops of *France*, to the Synod to be held at *Troyes*.

The 108th. is sent to *Luitbertus Archbishop of Mayence*, whom he orders to return to the Daughters of *Boson* and *Engeltruda* their Father and Mothers free Estate. And declares *Godfrey* and *Engeltruda* incapable of disposing of them; and in the following Letter, threatens Count *Marfroy* who was in possession of them, unless he presently restored them.

In the 110th. he complains to the Archbishop of *Besançon*, that he did not come to him to Condole his Persecution: He Exhorts him to come as soon as he can, and forbids him to Consecrate a Bishop in the Church of *Lausanne*, tho' the Prince command it, or the People desire it, till he hath considered what will be most Expedient.

The four following Letters are in the Council of *Troyes*. In the 115th. he cites Count *Bernard* to the Council of *Troyes*.

In the 117th. and 118th. he invites King *Charles* and *Lewis* to a Conference: King *Lewis* came, but not King *Charles*. The Pope complains of it in 119th. Letter, and lets him know, that he had adopted Prince *Boson* for his Son.

The 120th. is a Sentence of Excommunication against Count *Bernard*, who had deprived *Frotarius Archbishop of Bourges*, of his Archbishoprick and Revenues.

In the 121st. he threatens those with Excommunication, that had seized upon the Revenues of the Church of *St. Maurice of Tours*, unless they speedily restore them; and admonishes those that owe their Ninths and Tenth to pay them.

By the 122d. he leaves the Archbishop of *Arles* the Decision of the Controversy, between the Bishop of *Uzès* and *Avignon*, which could not be determined at *Troyes*, the Bishop of *Avignon* being absent.

The 123d. is an Excommunication of *Hugh*, the natural Son of King *Lewis*, and *Emmo* Brother of *Bernard*, for Conspiring the Death of their King.

The 124th. is addressed to the Bishop of *Dol*, and the Bishop of *Brittany*, who had withdrawn themselves from the Jurisdiction of the Archbishop of *Tours*, he charges them to submit; with menaces of Excommunication, if they fail.

In the 125th. to *Lewis the Stammerer*, he tells, how great Obligations he lay under to *Boson*, who brought him safe to *Pavia*, and begs his assistance in reducing the Enemies of the Holy See, and recommends to him *Agilmarus Bishop of Clermont*.

In the 126th. he accuses *Anspert Archbishop of Milan* of unkindness, in not sympathizing with him in his Sufferings. He commands him and his Suffragans to come next *Thursday* to meet him at *Pavia*. He gives the same Orders in the following Letter. He likewise Summons Count *Berengarius* by the 128th. and 131st. Letters, and *Suppo* by the 130th. In the 129th. he presses King *Lewis* to restore to the Daughters of *Boson* and *Engeltruda* the Free-Estate of their Father and Mother, of which he was in Possession.

In the 135th. he orders two Bishops to Excommunicate those that had stole *Wipert's* Son, and plundered his Country.

In the 136th. he advises Count *Hugh* to punish some Thieves.

In the 137th. he exhorts him, and two other Counts, to keep their League made with *Boson*.

In the 138th. he orders a Monk to obey Bishop *Wipert*, who had obtain'd him from his own Bishop and Abbot by Letters dimissory.

In the 139th. he orders the Archbishops of *Milan* and *Ravenna* to meet, when the Bishop of *Pavia* should require it.

In the 140th. he Authorises the Bishop of *Pavia* to Excommunicate those that had taken away a Woman.

In the 141st. he acquaints the Bishop of *Pavia* that he shall shortly be at *Turin*, and prays him to come thither. He intimates to him that he ought not to adhere to the

Archbishop of *Milan* in Prejudice of the *Roman Church's* Interest; and desires him to forward his Letters to the Suffragans of the Archbishop of *Ravenna*.
By the 142^d. he calls four Bishops to a Council to be held at *Pavia*.

The 143^d. is a Decree for the Confiscation of the Goods of an Abbey.

In the 144th. he promises Salvation to all that are kill'd in Battle against Heathens and Infidels, and absolves them as much as is in his power.

By the 145th. he Suspends the Bishop of *Venice* from Celebration of Divine Service; because he had communicated with some excommunicated Persons; till he and they appeared before him.

In the 146th. he gives leave to promote to sacred Orders, some Persons, who in their youth happened to be in Company where one kill'd his Companion.

In the 147th. he desires two Bishops to send home the Wife of *Rostagnus*, who deserting her Husband, was fled into their Diocese; and orders them to Excommunicate all that communicated with her.

In the 148th. he advises the Bishop of *Metz*, that he should not force a Man to marry a Woman who was contracted to him, who by her own confession was with Child by another Man.

In the 149th. he orders the Bishop of *Pavia* to mitigate the Penance imposed by his Predecessor on a Man, for being in Company when another was kill'd.

In the 150th. he orders the Bishop to cause Restitution to be made to some Persons he recommends, that were robbed.

In the 151st. he writes to the Bishop of *Besançon* that he had absolved *Fulcardus* and his Wife; and that he is again to admit them into his Communion.

The 152^d. is an exhortation to certain Bishops assembled in Council, to judge with Justice.

In the 153^d. he acquaints the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, that it being order'd by the Canons that Councils should be held twice a Year, he appointed one to be at the end of *March*; and orders him and his Suffragans to be there.

In the 154th. he writes to the same Archbishop, and tells him, that he wonders he should design to Ordain to the Bishoprick of *Sarjonne* another Person than the Priest *Lupo*, whom he had commanded him to Ordain; and forbids him doing it.

In the 155th. he writes to *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, and he Commands him and his Suffragans to come to a Council to be held at *Rome* the first of *March*, to choose an Emperor in the place of *Carloman*, whose Infirmities made him no longer able to bear the Burthen of Government. He adds, that as it belongs to the Pope and Bishops of *Italy* to Consecrate the Emperor, so it is chiefly their Right to call and choose him.

In the 156th. he Comforts the Duke of *Beneventum* for the loss he had sustained by the *Agarenians*.

The 157th. is only a Letter of Complement and Thanks to a Bishop that was very zealous for the Roman Church, and had enquired of his Health; and Condolance for the Death of his Brother. Here end the Letters of the eleventh Indiction, and those of the twelfth begin.

The six first Letters contain nothing very remarkable, being chiefly about Civil Matters.

In the 163^d. he forbids certain Bishops to Excommunicate the Person that brought the Emperor's Letters Patents, till his Cause was examined.

In the 165th. he Excommunicates a Count and his Wife for taking a Nun out of his Monastery, till they restored her.

In the 174th. 189th. 192^d. Letters he exhorts *Michael* King of *Bulgaria*, to submit himself to the Church of *Rome*.

In the 181st. and 182^d. he sharply reproves *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, for not coming to the Synod at *Rome*, after he had been thrice summoned, and threatneth to proceed against him, if he come not this fourth time. He forbids his holding any Assembly with any of the Kings of *France* that shall come into *Italy*.

In the 188th. to the Bishop of *Limoges*, he decides, that a Man ought not to be parted from his Wife; because he had baptized his Child himself in a Case of Necessity.

In the 190th. written to the Bishops of *Dalmatia*, he exhorts them to acknowledge the Jurisdiction of the Bishop of *Rome*, and to send thither their new chosen Bishop to be consecrated, and Receive the Pall from him.

The 191st. is to the Archbishops of *Arles*, *Narbonne*, and *Aix*. He orders them to confer with the Bishop of *Nîmes*, to oblige him not to molest the Monks of a certain Monastery, and gives them power, if he does not do as he desires, to suspend him from all his Priestly Functions, till he comply, or appear at *Rome* to give an account of his Conduct.

In the 194th. he Exhorts a *Slavonian* Lord to continue in the Faith of the Roman Church, and live in its Obedience. He saith he hath written to Archbishop *Methodius*, who was ordained by Pope *Adrian* his Predecessor, because

he had heard he taught other Doctrines than what he had professed in Presence of the Holy See.

The following Letter is to this *Methodius* Titular Archbishop of *Pannonia*: he commands him to come to *Rome* and justify his Doctrine. Forbids him to Celebrate Mass in the *Slavonian* Tongue, but only in *Latin* or *Greek*; as, saith he, the Church of Jesus Christ dispersed over the whole Earth, practiseth in all places.

The 196th. is to *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, about his refusing to come to the Synod at *Rome*. The Pope had suspended him from celebrating Divine Service, till he came to *Rome* to justify himself: but not regarding of that Suspension, he continued to do all Episcopal Functions. The Pope peremptorily commands him to come to *Rome*, or send his Legates.

In the 197th. he thanks King *Lewis* for his good will, and invites him to come speedily to *Rome*, promising to do his utmost to make him to be declared Emperor.

The 198th. Letter is to *Herard* Archbishop of *Auch*, and to the Bishops of *Comminges*, *Conserans*, and *Bigores*, concerning the Disorders in their Dioceses, which they could neither restrain by Exhortations nor Excommunications. They had written to the Pope to joyn his Authority to theirs, to put a stop to them. The Pope writes to them to use their utmost Endeavours to rectify the Disorders of the People committed to their charge. And because the greatest were in the Marriages of Kindred, he saith, 'tis not permitted to Christians to marry their Kindred so long as they can make out any Relation. He declares all those, that are so married, and will keep their Wives, or those that shall so marry for the future, to be subject to the Church's Anathema by Apostolick Authority, and forbids all Priests to give them the Sacrament, till they have done Penance. He also declares it unlawful to have two Wives, to forsake one Wife and marry another for no cause whatsoever, or to have a Wife and a Concubine at the same time. He forbids the Laity to meddle with the Church Goods. He orders Priests and Clerks to submit to their Bishops, and to do nothing without their consent; and that the Laity do obey their Bishop under pain of Excommunication.

The following Letters concern the Affair of *Photius*, which we have spoken of in the History of the eighth Council.

In the 204th. Letter he writes to the Empress *Engelberga*, who had desired him to Absolve *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, and humbly represents to her, that he could not do it without the consent of his Brethren the Bishops, with whose concurrence he had excommunicated him. That he must either come or send Deputies to the Synod to be held the eleventh of *October* at *Rome*, to answer such things as are laid to his Charge: and after Satisfaction given, he will Absolve him, and Receive him into his Communion. He saith he will Celebrate the Anniversary of the Emperor her Husband; and that he prays for the Soul of her Brother *Suppo*, that God would forgive his Sins.

The four following Letters are concerning the Troubles about the Election of *Landulphus* to the Bishoprick of *Capua*.

The 216th. Letter is written to King *Charles*, whom, he saith, he hoped to raise to the Dignity of Emperor, that therefore he was come to *Ravenna*: That he hoped he would labour all he could to Re-establish the Honour and Dignity of the Roman Church, and subdue its Enemies. That at his Return he found its Enemies more violent; having not only seized and carried away the Possessions, but the Persons, that belonged to the Church of *Rome*. He desires him to send him three Persons before he comes, that he may concert with them concerning what belongs to the Honour and Good of the Holy See.

In the next Letter he prays the same Prince to protect the Church of *Rome* against its Enemies.

The 218th. is address'd to the Archbishop of *Ravenna*; he wonders he had not recourse to the Holy See, to redress the Injury done him; he intimates, that he had sent a Prudent Person to *Ravenna*, whom he empowered to inform himself of all that had been done to him, he orders him to be at *Rome* by the beginning of *October* at the Synod, and promises all manner of Assistance, but finds fault with his quitting his Church to live elsewhere.

In the 219th. he orders him to refer it to the Bishop of *Pavia*, whom he had commissioned to Excommunicate those that deserve it.

The 221st. Letter is to the Clergy of *Milan*, whom he orders to proceed to the Election of a new Archbishop instead of *Anspert*, whom he had deposed in his Synod, and tells them, that he sends the Bishop of *Pavia* and *Rimini* to joyn with them in this Election: This Letter is the first of those that were written in the 11th. Indiction, beginning in *September* 879. In the following Letter, he acquaints King *Charles* with the deposing of *Anspert* and *Joseph*, whom the former had ordained Bishop of *Vercelli*, and that he had put another Bishop into *Vercelli*, whom he desires him to maintain.

In the 223th. he enjoins the People of *Vercelli* to Receive the Bishop he had ordained.

In the 224th. he threatens to Excommunicate *Nottingus* Bishop of *Novara*, unless he restored to the Empress *Engelberga* the Goods belonging to her.

In the 225th. he declares the *Amalphytains* Excommunicate, till they separated from the Heathens, with whom they maintained too familiar a Correspondence.

The 226th. is written to four Bishops, whom he appoints to judge the Business of a Lady called *Theodora*, the Widow of *Trisigian*. She came to *Rome* to complain, that after the Death of her Husband, her Brother-in-law had forced her to become a Nun, and that without the Blessing of a Priest; and that she had often declared and protested against the Veil, and had worn it but fifteen days: The Pope orders them to Assemble and Examine this Affair, and if they find these things true, then to declare her discharged of her Vow.

In Letter the 227th. he commands the Bishop of *Naples* and Magistrates of *Anagni*, to break their League with the *Sarazens*; and threatens to Excommunicate them, unless they do it by the first of *December*.

In the 228th. he reproves a Bishop for not coming to his Synod, and Summons him to appear on the eighth of *December*, to give his Reasons why he had excommunicated a certain Nobleman.

He gives the same Reproof to another Bishop in the following Letter, and cites him to come and answer the Accusations brought against him by all his Clergy.

In the 230th. written to King *Charles*, he wonders that he did not acquaint him with his Arrival at *Pavia*; and prays him if he be there, to send him Ambassadors with Honourable Letters, that he might come and meet him.

In the 231st. he thanks this Prince for leaving the Church of *Vercelli*, in Possession of the Bishop he had ordained. He excuseth himself, that he could not absolve *Anspert* as he had desired, because the Sentence given against him was in these Terms, that he should be suspended and excommunicated, till he had appeared and justified himself before the Holy See.

By the 232^d. he enjoins the Bishop of *Regio* to rebuild a Church lately burned, to put in a Priest, and to send thither the Holy Christin; which the Bishop neglecting, he in the following Letter orders the Bishop of *Pavia* to do it.

In the 234th. he reproves Bishop *Egilbert* for communicating with excommunicated Persons, and forbids him to communicate with *Luitfredus* and *Odebricus* excommunicated Persons; because they detain'd Goods of the Empress *Engelberga*.

In Letter the 237th. he Excommunicates *Luitfredus*, for receiving a Nun which was gotten out of his Nunnery, and detaining the Empresses Goods.

In the following Letter he threatens to excommunicate Count *Lambert*, for detaining the Goods of the Empress, and of the Church of *Rome*.

By the 239th. he commits to the care of Abbot *Gisulphus*, the Empresses Monastery.

In the 240th. he Congratulates the *Grecian* Emperors Officers, concerning their Victory over the *Sarazens*, and exhorts them to come to *Rome* to assist him against the *Agarenians*.

In the 241st. he commends the Bishop of *Naples*'s Zeal for the Church of *Rome*; he exhorts him to break his League with the *Sarazens*; and declares, that he will excommunicate the *Amalphytains* if they do it not, of which he gives them Notice in the next Letter.

Letter the 243^d. is to intreat King *Charles* the Gross, to leave the Bishop of *Lausanne* in the free Possession of his Bishoprick, and to oblige Count *Hugo*, to restore what he hath taken from the Church of *Besancon*: In the following Letter, he recommends the affair of the Church of *Langes* to the Bishop of *Vercelli*, and in the 245th. to *Thiericus* Archbishop of *Besancon*.

In the 246th. he commends the Zeal of King *Charles* toward the Church of *Rome*, and desires him to send some Body with Authority, to see that all be restored to the *Roman* Church, which has been taken from it.

The 247th. is to *Ssentopulcher*, an Earl of *Slavonia*; he congratulates his Faith and Piety, and his Submission to the Holy See, of which he had been informed by *Methodius* Bishop of *Moravia*, whom he had sent to *Rome*: He saith, he had questioned him concerning his Creed, and found it the same with the *Roman*; and whether his Sentiments were Orthodox, and found him to be sound in all points of Catholick Doctrine; upon which Account, he sends him to Govern his Church, with the Quality of Archbishop, which he confirms for ever. He adds, that he had consecrated *Hichinus* Bishop of *Nitria*, and desires him to send some other Priest, that he may Ordain him Bishop of some other Town, and that these three Bishops may regulate Affairs as need shall require: He orders all Priests and Clergymen to submit to the Archbishop; then he repeats what he had before said, about the Celebration of Divine Service in the *Slavonian* Tongue; and first, he approves of

Prayer in that Tongue; secondly, he saith, 'tis not contrary to Faith nor sound Doctrine, to say or sing Mass, the Gospel, or the Lessons of the Old or New Testament, or the Hours of other Service in the *Slavonian* Language, provided that they be well translated; for God is not only Author of the *Hebrew*, *Greek*, and *Latin*, but also of all other Languages which he hath made to Praise him with. Thirdly, he thinks it fit to read the Evangelists in *Latin*, for the greater Reverence, and afterwards in the *Slavonian* Tongue, in respect of the People who understand it not, as 'tis practised in some Churches. Fourthly, he writes, that if it pleases the Prince and his Judges to hear Mass in *Latin* rather than in the *Slavonian* Language, it may for them be celebrated in that Tongue.

In the 248th. he reproves a Bishop, for having violated a Treaty made with the Bishop of *Capua* in his Ordination; he orders him to go on with it, and in Case of default, threatens him with Excommunication: He permits him to come to him, if he have any complaint or excuse to make.

The 249th. is to King *Charles* the Gross, he thanks him for the good Offices he does to the Church of *Rome*; and particularly that he commanded all the Counts and Bishops his Neighbours, to defend the Territories of *St. Peter*, against the Assaults of all Enemies, not only bad Christians but *Sarazens*, who are always Pillaging the *Roman* Church. He saith, he would have conferred with *Wibodus*, Son of Count *Lambert*, but he failed of Meeting at the place appointed: He promises that Count *Boson* shall find no Refuge or Asylum at his Court; and rejoiceth, that King *Charles* will quickly come and beg of him, to send Commissioners that may do him Justice.

The two following Letters are about *Photius*'s Affair, which hath been spoken of elsewhere.

The 252^d. is also to King *Charles*, he acquaints him, that he waits his Arrival with Impatience, and complains that he had not sent him Commissioners according to his desire, and that an excommunicated Person called *Georges*, being come from him, had seized upon certain Revenues in the Possession of the Church, pretending they belonged to him, and also, that he very much molested his Neighbours. He desires him to remedy this disorder, and to remove the Enemies of the Holy See; this, and the following Letters, are written in the XIVth. Indiction, which begins at the Month of *September* 880.

By the 253^d. he Summons the Archbishop of *Ravenna* to the Synod, which had been prorogued to *November*, to determine with other Bishops some Ecclesiastical Affairs. He acquaints him, that in this Assembly, they will go upon the Affair of Count *Dens Dedit*, whom the Archbishop of *Ravenna* had excommunicated, for contracting Marriage with one of his Relations; adding, that tho' indeed it was in his Power to absolve him, yet since the Council was so nigh, he thought it convenient to defer the Conclusion of it to the Synod, where he would be present. He tells him, that the Earl's Wife had presented a Petition to him, wherein she says, that he was made Privy to her Marriage, and soon after she was married, he had admitted and invited them to his Communion; he also gives him an account of another Affair.

The 254th. is a Circular Letter to the Bishops of *Italy*, to call them to the Synod which was to be held the seventh of *November*.

The 255th. is address to King *Charles*, he acquaints him, that the *Sarazens* were defeated by the *Greeks*, but that those *Barbarians* were yet very troublesome, and desires his Succours against them.

It appears by Letter the 256th. directed to *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, that *John* the VIIIth. did once pardon him, and received him into his Communion; but that the Archbishop having again offended him, by apprehending two Monks of the *Roman* Church, and putting them in Prison: The Pope commands him to release them. In the next Letter, he threatens the Proctor of *Pavia* that had arrested them.

By the 258th. he absolves the Marquess *Adelbert*, because he found him faithful to the Church of *Rome*, and his Subjects, provided they make satisfaction to the said Church within fifteen days. In the next he writes, that he hath sent Legates with Instructions to treat with him; and Exhorts him to Compliance with his desires, and not to come to *Rome*.

In the 260th. to *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, he approves of the Ordination of *Joseph* to the Bishoprick of *Asti*, tho' he had been before ordained Bishop of *Vercelli*: But his Ordination being found faulty, he was deprived and put in the same State and Condition he was before.

In the 261st. he threatens the Archdeacon of *Milan* with Excommunication, unless he submits to his Archbishop, and return to his Church.

The 262^d. is to a Private Churchman of *Milan*, whom *Anspert* had excommunicated, for raising troubles in the Church, and detaining some of his Goods: he Exhorts him to his Duty, and to give full satisfaction to his Archbishop, or else he confirms the Excommunication against him.

Of the Popes during the 9th Century. In the 263d. he entreats *Lewis* and *Carloman* to joyn their consent with *Charles*, that *Engelberga* may retire to *Rome*, where he promises to have such an Eye over her Actions, that she shall undertake nothing against them; nor the Emperor for the future.

The 264th. is a Bull, by which he puts under the Protection of the Holy See, the Monasteries and other Benefices belonging to one *Harderick*.

In the 265th. he complains of the Bishop of *Naples*, for not breaking the Treaty with the *Sarazens*.

The two following Letters are about a Difference between the Bishop of *Trent* and *Verona*, about some Ecclesiastical Revenues, he writes about it to the Bishop of *Trent*, in Letter 266th. and appoints them Judges in Letter 267th.

The 268th. is directed to *Methodius* Archbishop of *Sclavonia*, he comforts him under some Persecutions, which he suffered from a certain Bishop; assuring him, that he had neither contributed to it, nor privately written against him: He exhorts him to be zealous for Religion, and promiseth him Justice against his Enemy.

By the 269th. he begs a speedy Relief of *Charles* the Emperor against the *Sarazens*.

In the 270th. he pronounces *Athanasius* Bishop of *Naples* excommunicate, for not breaking the Treaty made with the *Sarazens*.

The 271st. is to the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, who had brought *Alaericus* into his City from the Emperor. He blames his Carriage, and pretends 'tis contrary to his Oath. He promises him, that returning from *Naples*, he will come to *Ravenna*, and do Justice to that Church. He enjoyns him to ordain *Dominicus* Archdeacon, Bishop of *Fayance*, whom he had nominated to that End.

In the 272d. written likewise to the Archbishop of *Ravenna*, he reproves him for having obliged a married Woman to leave her Husband, and marry her Ravisher; and accuses him of Disobedience to the Church of *Rome*: Therefore forbids him ordaining any, till he had appeared at the Synod to be held at *Rome* in *October*.

In the 273d. he commands the same Archbishop to dismiss the Clerks belonging to the Bishop of *Playsance*, that had retired to *Ravenna*, whom the Archbishop had received without Letters of Leave from their own Bishop; and commands him to absolve the Clerks of *Playsance*, whom he had excommunicated. We see by these Letters, that this Archbishop had frequent Contests with *Rome*. This more plainly appears by the following Letter, which sheweth that this Prelate had ordained another Person Bishop of *Fayance* than him whom the Pope had nominated. The Pope by this Letter excommunicates him, and forbids him taking possession of this Bishoprick, or exercising any Function, till he had presented himself to the Synod at *Rome*.

He cites a second Time the Archbishop of *Ravenna* by Letter, 274. intimating to him, That he stands accused of several Crimes, and chiefly of Perjury.

In the 275th. he determines the Affair of one *Deus Dedit*, an Inhabitant of *Ravenna*. His Archbishop had excommunicated him as convicted of Incest: He appeals to the Holy See, and came to *Rome* to clear himself; but no Body appearing from the Archbishop, the Pope would not absolve *Deus Dedit*, till he had written to the Archbishop to send Accusers and Witnesses to *Rome*. He sent a Priest and a Deacon with an Accusation in Writing: *Deus Dedit* answered, and proved his Marriage to be according to Ecclesiastical and Civil Laws. The Pope and the Synod declar'd him absolved, and confirmed his Marriage.

In the 277th. he writes to *Charles* the Emperor to send him two Legates, that he might regulate the Wrong and Injustices the Church suffers under his Reign.

The Archbishop of *Ravenna* not appearing at the Synod, was excommunicated. The Pope advises those of *Ravenna* by Letter, 278. and forbids them to communicate with him.

By the 279th. Letter he congratulates the Emperor *Charles*'s intended Journey into *Italy*. He exhorts him to succour the Church of *Rome*, and to expel *Guy* out of the Possession of the Lands of the Church.

In the 280th. he thanks the Bishop *Luitwardus* for having procured the Emperor's Journey into *Italy*.

By the 281st. he commands the People of *Geneva* to obey *Optandus*, whom he had ordained their Bishop.

In the 282d. he prays the Bishops and Counts of *Italy* to intercede with the Emperor, that *Engelberga* might come to *Rome*.

The 283d. is directed to the Archbishop of *Cologne*, touching a Priest long since excommunicated by Pope *Nicholas*, for having communicated with *Ingeltrude*, and had undergone eleven Years Penance; the Pope absolves and restores him at the Request of the Archbishop of *Cologne*. He likewise writes to this Archbishop to judge concerning the Divorce of *Gideon*, whose Wife had committed Adultery with her Brother, according to what *St. Austine* writes on that Matter in his Book of Adulterous Marriages; and what is ordered by Pope *Innocent*.

In the two following Letters he praises several Lords for their Zeal to the Holy See.

In the 286th. he expresseth his Joy for the Emperor's coming to *Ravenna*, and begs him to hasten his Journey.

The 287th. is to the King of *Bulgaria*: He expresses his Admiration, that he hath not sent Ambassadors to *Rome*, and exhorts him to do it, and acknowledge the Holy See.

In the 288th. he reproves the Archbishop of *Vienna* for favouring the Allies of *Boson*, and cites him to *Rome*.

The 292d. is written to the same Archbishop, and blames him for causing *Optandus* Bishop of *Geneva* to be apprehended, and ordaining another in his Place. He cites him a second Time to *Rome*.

In the 293d. he complains to the Emperor, that the Marquess *Guy* had seiz'd on the Goods of the Church of *Rome*, and refused to do him Justice; desiring him to come in Person and do him Right.

By the 294th. he absolves the Bishop of *Naples*, provided he break the Alliance made with the *Sarazens*, and strangle the most guilty of those that are in his Hands, and send him the rest.

The 295th. is an Answer to *Oteran* Archbishop of *Vienna*, who to clear himself, writ to the Pope, That he had ordained a Bishop for *Geneva* before the Arrival of *Optandus*. The Pope answered, That 'twas well known to the World how long that Church had been without a Bishop; and that 'twas for that Reason, and the Necessity of that Church, that he had ordained *Optandus* Bishop of that Place. That he ought not to object this against him, that he was not of that Church; since he himself was neither a Clerk, nor instructed nor baptised in the Church of *Vienna*, of which he was now Bishop. He cites him to the Synod at *Rome* with *Adalbart* Bishop of *Maurienne*, who was accused of having injured the Bishop of *Grenoble*; 'tis to him that the following Letter is directed.

The 297th. is to *Michael* King of *Bulgaria*, whom he often exhorts to send Ambassadors, and submit to the Holy See.

In Letter the 298th. written to the Empress and *Luitwardus* Bishop of *Vercelli*, he entreats her to press the Emperor to assist him against the Infidels, and to send *Engelberga* to *Rome*.

By Letter the 299th. directed to *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, he confirms the Privileges of the Church of *Milan*; and exhorts him to labour and pray for the Church of *Rome*. Here end the Letters of the XIVth. Indiction, and begin those of the XVth. beginning in *Sept.* 881.

In the 300th. Letter, he enjoyns the Archbishop of *Ravenna* to restore to Dean *John* all he had taken away from him.

In the 301st. he orders the Clergy of *Ravenna* to apprehend *Maimbert*, whom he had excommunicated, and send him to him.

By the following, he adviseth his firm Friend to do it with Expedition: He enjoyns the same Thing to Duke *John*, in Letter 303.

The 304th. is a condoling Letter, written to the People of *Ravenna* for the Death of their Bishop: He confirms the Election they had made of another, and charges them to respect him. He recommends to them the Dukes *Deus Dedit* and *John*, together with their Estates.

In the Letter 305th. to the Abbot *Hugh*, he desires him to exhort King *Lewis* to come to *Rome*, and warns him to shun the Communion of *Formosus*, of *John* Archbishop of *Rouen*, *Adelard* Archbishop of *Tours*, and *Frotarius* Archbishop of *Bourges*.

Letter 306. is directed to King *Charles*, whom he entreats to confirm King *Carloman* in his good Intentions toward the *Roman* Church.

In the 307th. he sends to *Suppo* to meet him at Mount *Cenis*, and to bring thither to him the Princess *Engelberga*, *Anspert* Archbishop of *Milan*, *Wibodus* Bishop of *Parma*, and some other Persons of Trust.

In the 308th. he commends to a Bishop the Care of a vacant Church, till it be provided of a Pastor.

The following Letters are not set down according to the Order of their Dates.

In Letter the 309th. written to *Aldephonsus* King of *Gallicia*, and all the Christians of that Country: He makes the Church of *Oviedo* a Metropolitan Church, with Authority over the Kingdom of *Gallicia*. In the next he advises that Prince to have the Church of *St. James*'s consecrated by the Spanish Bishops, and desires some Moor-Cavaliers to serve against the Enemies of the Church of *Rome*.

In the 311th. he grants the Communion to some Priests of *Salerno*, who tho' excommunicated by Pope *Nicholas* his Predecessor, yet were suffered to exercise their Functions, on Condition they should fast every *Monday* and *Friday* for three Years.

The 312th. is a Fragment of a Letter written to the King of the *Bulgarians*, accusing him of Schism, because he received the Sacrament of such People as the Church of *Rome* counted excommunicated.

The

Of the Popes during the 9th Century. In the 313th. he creates *Ansegisus* his Vicar in *France* and *Germany* with Power to assemble Synods, if need required, and to regulate the Affairs of that Country: He orders him also, to publish the Decrees of the Holy See, and to refer to him all Affairs of Difficulty or Consequence.

In the 314th. he gives Leave to *Hincmarus* Archbishop of *Rheims*, to ordain in the Church of *Laon*, him that was chosen in the Place of his deposed Nephew; this Letter is dated on the fifth of *January*, Indiction IX. that is to say the Year 876.

Letter the 315th. directed to the Bishops and Archbishops of the Kingdom of *Lewis* of *Bavaria*; he smartly reproves them, for not hindering their King from entering into the Kingdom of *Charles* the Emperor; and he acquaints them, that he hath sent two Legates to compose the Differences between those Princes, and to excommunicate him that shall not agree to their Decisions.

He writes the same Thing to the Counts of the Kingdom of *Bavaria* in the following Letter: On the contrary, he praises the Prelates and Counts of the Empire, because they continued faithful to him; and reproves in Letter the 318th. those that had abandon'd him.

Letter 319th. is directed to all the Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots, Priests, Judges and People of *France* and *Germany*. He gives them to understand, That *Gregory Nomenclator* and *George* his Son-in-law, having been impeached before the *Roman* Church, and accused in two Writings, he had cited them by two Bishops, and by his Secretary, who had delivered them Copies of the Accusations against them; that they had put off their Appearance from Day to Day, and in the mean Time had conspired to introduce the *Sarazens* into *Rome*. That not being able to effect their Designs, and the Day of their Trial approaching, they had by Night opened a Gate of the City, and fled with Bishop *Formosus*, and some others, that had conspired against the Emperor *Charles*. That he had sent two Bishops to cite them, but not finding them; and having put off their Trials to another Day, and sent again without Success to seek them, he had assembled a Council, and pronounced against them the following Sentence: That *Formosus* Bishop of *Porto*, heretofore sent Ambassador by Pope *Nicholas* to the King of *Bulgaria*, had engaged that Prince to receive no other Bishop sent by the Holy See but himself: Also being convicted of having done his Endeavours to pass from his Bishoprick to that of *Rome*; of having quitted his Church; fled out of *Rome*, and conspired against *Charles* the Emperor; should be excommunicated and deprived of his Priestly Office, if he did not appear to justify himself within fifteen Days, that is to say, by the 2d. of *May*, and that without Hopes of Restoration, if he past twenty Days without appearing. That *Gregory*, *Stephen*, *George*, *Sergius* and *Constantine*, Authors and Accomplices of the said Conspiracy, and guilty of divers other Crimes, should be also excommunicated unless they appeared within ten Days, and be for ever anathematized, if they do not do it in fifteen. He adviseth by this circular Letter all Prelates and Believers not to communicate with them; and declares those that do so, excommunicated as well as they.

Letter 320th. is directed to *Photius*, and written concerning the Addition of the *Filioque* added to the Creed: Pope *John* the Eighth disapproves of it.

These Letters are followed by some Fragments of others, written by *John* the Eighth, gathered out of *Gratian*.

In the first, taken out of a Letter written to the Bishop of *Vannes*, he determines, that a Bishop having committed Man-slaughter, can never perform Priestly Functions afterwards.

In the second, out of a Letter written to *Rostagnus* Archbishop of *Arles*, That the Sacrament cannot be given to a Person ravished, till she hath quitted her Ravisher.

In the third, cited out of a Letter to the Archbishop of *Narbonne*, he submits to the Judgment of this Metropolitan, an excommunicated Priest who had been put to Penance by some Bishops of his Province, and adviseth him to take six Bishops with him to judge of it.

In the fourth he writes to the Archbishop of *Cologne*, That he cannot grant him the Pall, because in the Letter by which he desired it, he neither spoke according to the Custom of Universal Councils, nor the Decrees of the Popes, and that

he had not signed the Letter, nor sent any one to testify the Truth of it by Oath.

Of the Popes during the 9th Century. Lastly, There is a Fragment of a Constitution concerning the Cardinals, attributed to Pope *John VIII.* which orders, That they shall be present at least twice a Month in the Churches, to which they are intitled, that they may inform themselves of the Demeanour of the Clergy, prevent Disorders, and judge of all Differences between the Clergy and Laity in Ecclesiastical Affairs; he also commits to their Charge, the Care of Monasteries; he likewise commands them to be twice a Week at the Palace, according to the Command of *Leo IV.* to regulate Affairs there. In fine, he grants them half the Revenues and Contribution of the Parishes of *Rome*, upon Condition that they perform Divine Service there. These Constitutions do not appear to be so ancient as *John VIII.*

Father *Labbe* hath made an Addition of some Letters, which he supposes to belong to Pope *John VIII.* but either they are forged as the three first, or they are Grants of Privileges, which are not of *John* the VIIIth's only, as the fourth and sixth; or they are found elsewhere, as the fifth, which differs not from Letter 113th. and the seventh, which is a Paper of Instructions, given to the Legates sent to *Constantinople*, about the Affair of *Photius*. [These Letters of Pope *John's* are extant in Tome 9. of the Councils, with the Fragments.]

After *John VIII.* the See was held by *Maurinus*, and afterwards by *Adrian III.* they lived but a short Time, and did nothing considerable. *Stephen V.* who succeeded, writ two Letters into the East; one to the Emperor *Basilicus*, and the other to the Oriental Bishops, about the Affair of *Photius*. There is also a little Letter that bears his Name, to *Robert* Bishop of *Metz*, in which 'tis decided, that a Clerk having lost one Finger, might be promoted to Holy Orders.

A Fragment of another Letter to *Fulke* Archbishop of *Rheims*, in Favour of *Teutboldus* chosen Bishop of *Langres*; which commands him to put him in Possession of that Bishoprick. I do not mention another in Favour of the Church of *Narbonne*, against the Rights of the Church of *Tarragon*, which is a supposititious Monument full of Falsities. [His Epistles are in Tom. 9. of the Councils.]

At the End of this Age, the Church of *Rome* was troubled by the Election of *Formosus* Bishop of *Ostia*, translated to the Bishoprick of *Rome*: This Man had been deposed by Pope *John VIII.* But being returned under the Papacy of *Marinus*, he used all Arts and Interest to obtain the Holy See; but finding himself hated and rudely used by the *Romans*, he procured the Emperor *Arnoldus* to come to *Rome*, who beheaded several of the Chief of that City, who came to meet him. After his Death, which happened in the Year 896. about the fifth or sixth of his Popedom, the Holy See was disputed between *Boniface* and *Stephen*.

This last being an Enemy to *Formosus's* Memory, dug up his Corps, dress'd him, and stript him of his Pontifical Habit, and after having cut off his Fingers, threw him into the *Tyber*; and declared, that all whom he had ordained should be ordained anew; and made this cruel and unreasonable Proceeding be approved of by a Council held at *Rome*: But Pope *Romanus* that succeeded him in the Year 900. revok'd what his Predecessor had done: And his Papacy, and that of his Successor *Theodorus* lasting but few Months, *John IX.* in a Council, disannulled all that had been done against *Formosus*, declared all his Ordinations good, condemned to the Fire the Acts of the Council, held under *Stephen IV.* excommunicated those that had dug up *Formosus's* Body, and forbid for the Future all such like Proceedings.

These last Popes have written very little: There are two Letters of *Formosus's*; one to *Stilianus* about the Affairs of the East, another to the Bishops of *England*; but the latter which is likewise attributed to Pope *Leo V.* belongs to neither of them, being writ at a Council, supposed to be held the Year 995. which neither agrees with the Time of *Formosus's* being Pope, nor with the Reign of King *Edward*, in whose Time this Council is placed. They attribute to *Stephen IV.* two Letters to the Archbishop of *Narbonne*, but both seem to be supposititious. As to the Letters of *John IX.* we shall speak of them in the History of the following Age.

C H A P. XVII.

Containing the Ecclesiastical History of the Lives and Martyrologies of the Saints.

THIS Age had but few Writers, who attempted to give an Account of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of it in general, but had an Abundance of Authors, who compos'd the single Lives of several Saints.

Among the Ecclesiastical and Profane Historians of the first Sort, which flourish'd in this Age, we may reckon *Sergius*, of whom *Photius* [*Col. 67.*] speaks; and assures us, That this Author wrote an History of all Things memorable, both in Church and State, from the Time of *Constantinus* to the *Sch.* Year of *Michael Balbus*, which was the 528th. Year of Jesus Christ. It is evident that he was a Layman and a military Officer. Since he relates also the Actions of the Army, as well as his Thoughts concerning the Disputes, then on Foot, about Religion: We have not this Work. *Photius* observes, That his Style was clear, elegant and unaffected: He used very proper Words and Expressions; that his Composition was very curious, and his Method pleasant, easie and natural; which he judges the best Properties of an Ecclesiastical Historian.

Eginhardus, Secretary to *Charles the Great*, and Founder of the Monastery of *Selgenstat* upon the *Maine*, in the Diocese of *Mentz*, wrote the Life of *Charles the Great*, and the Annals [of the most observable Things done in the Reigns of King *Pepin*, *Charles the Great*, and *Lewis the Godly*] beginning at the Year 741. and ending at 829. [Both these Works are printed together at *Cologne*, 1521. *Quarto*, at *Frankfort*, 1584. in *Fol.* and 1594. in *Octavo*.] We have also some Letters of his [*viz.* 62 put forth by *Du Chesne*, in his Appendix, *Tom. 2.*] a Treatise upon the Cross, and an Account of the Translation of the Relicks of *St. Marcellinus* and *St. Peter*, which *Raclarus* and *Dionys* cunningly conveyed out of the Church of *St. Tiburtius*, near *Rome*. [This last Treatise is extant in *Surius*, *June 2d.* and the other is quite perished.]

Theganus, a Suffragan of the Bishoprick of *Treves*, hath written an History of *Lewis the Kind* [or *Godly*.] *Pithens* hath put it out, with the *French* Writers of this Age, at *Frankfort*, 1594. p. 291. And *Du Chesne* in his Collection of the same Writers, *Tom. 2.*] He flourished from the Year 810. to 840 or thereabouts.

Petrus Siculus, being sent, in 870. by the Emperor *Basil* to *Tibrica*, in *Armenia*, to procure the Exchange of some Prisoners; and there having had some Conferences with the *Manichees* of that Country, call'd *Paulitians*, made a Treatise, containing the History of [the Rise, Progress and Downfall of] the *Manichees*, and the Doctrines which they maintained. This Treatise hath been translated by *Raderus* [a Jesuit] and printed in *Greek* and *Latin* at *Inzolslate*, in 1604. and in *Biblioth. Patr.* [*Tom. 16.*] It is dedicated to an Archbishop of *Bulgaria*. In it he reduces the Errors of the *Manichees* to six principal Heads, which are these, 1. That there are two Principles, a good one and an evil; the one the Creator and Governor of this World, the other of the World to come. 2. That Jesus Christ was not born of the Virgin. 3. That the Elements in the Sacrament, are not converted into the very Body and Blood of Christ. 4. That they condemn and disgrace the Cross. 5. That they reject the Books of the Old Testament and *St. Peter's* Epistles. 6. That they account the Ecclesiastical Ministry of Priests and Elders unnecessary. He then relates the Story of *Munes* and his Sect. All that he says is taken out of the *Catechises* of *St. Cyril* of *Jerusalem* and *Epiphanius*. He promised a Confutation of these Errors, but hath not done it in that Treatise. Father *Sirmondus* saw a Confutation of two of these Articles, by several Texts of Scripture, in a MS. in the *Vatic. Lib.*

But, of all the Ecclesiastical Authors of this Age, there is none more famous than *Anastasius*, an Abbot and Library-Keeper of the Church of *Rome*, who flourished under the Pope'doms of *Nicolas I.* *Adrian II.* and *John VIII.* He was sent by *Lewis II.* Emperor of *Italy*, to *Basil* Emperor of the East [to obtain a Marriage between his Master's Daughter and *Basil's* Son] and was present at [the last Session of] * the 8th. Council;

* This Council, which passes for the 8th. General Council in *Corisolanus's* Collection, is rejected both by the *Greeks* and *Romans*, for an unlawful one, being called without the Consent of the *Western* Emperors, and managed by the *Iconolatre*, or Image-Worshippers, with Force and Cruelty, against *Iconomachi*, especially the great *Photius*, who was deposed from his See of *Constantinople*, and *Ignatius* put into it.

where he was of great Use to the Pope's Legates, because he understood both the *Greek* and *Latin* Tongues well. He hath translated the Acts of this Council, and of the 7th. [at *Nice*] with several other Records of the *Greek* Church, [which are extant in *Tom. 7.* and 8. of the Councils;] as also a threefold Chronology; containing [a Collection of such Ecclesiastical Matters as are related in] the *Chronica*

of *Nicephorus*, Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Georgius Syncellus* and *Theophanes*, from the Beginning of the World to the Reign of *Leo Armenus* [put out by *Fabrotus*, at *Paris*, 1649. with his own Notes.] A Collection of several Pieces concerning the History of the *Monothelites*, published by Father *Sirmondus* [at *Paris*] in 1620. [and in the *Biblioth. Patrum Tom. 12.* p. 531.] The Life of *St. John* the Alms-giver, Patriarch of *Alexandria*, mentioned by *Sigebert* and *Trithemius* [is not extant] and the Martyrdom of *St. Demetrius*, published by Father *Maillon*, in his *Analec.* *Tom. 1.* [p. 65.] His Translations have all Prefaces to them, made by him, and very well written: But his most excellent one, is that which he hath prefixed to the Version of *St. Dionysius the Areopagite*, made by *Erigenes*, where he speaks of the *Scholia* which he had translated. He is commonly thought to be the Author of the Popes Lives, which bear the Name of Pope *Damasus*, but falsely, and they are printed under *Anastasius's* Name at *Mentz*, in 1612. [1602.] But 'tis doubtful whether they are all his, and many believe that they are a Composition, taken out of several Authors. Father *Labbe* assures us, That he saw a MS. written in *Charles the Great's* Time, which contain'd the Lives of the first Popes; which, if it be true, this Work can't be all *Anastasius's*. I am of Opinion, that the Lives of the first Popes, as far as *Damasus*, were written by a more ancient Author, who put them out under *Damasus's* Name: But the latter are *Anastasius's*, who reviewed them, and put them in that Form they now are in, and concluded them with the Life of *Nicholas I.* for I take the Lives of the five following Popes to be written by *William*, who succeeded *Anastasius* in the Office of Library-keeper, in the Church of *Rome*. Nevertheless *Anastasius* might write the Life of *Adrian II.* for he certainly outliv'd him: And perhaps he lived long enough to write the Lives of the four following Popes. He wrote tolerable good *Latin*, and was a learned Man for his Time. He was a good Politician, and studied the Interest of the Church of *Rome*.

There remains only the Author of the Treatise, called *Liber Synodicus*, whose Name is unknown. His Work is an Abridgment of the first Councils, commonly called, *The little Synodical Book*: It ends with the Council held by *Photius*, in 877. which is accounted the 8th. General Council, which makes it probable that he lived about the End of the 9th. Age. This Work hath been printed at *Straßburg*, in 1601. [in *Quarto*,] and since is put by Father *Labbe* into the last Collection of the Councils. It is a very short and plain Abridgment, and contains nothing considerable or extraordinary about the History of the Councils.

The Number of the Historians of this Age, which have written the Lives and Panegyrics of the Saints, is very great; The chief of them are these that follow: *Michael Syncellus* of the Patriarch *Nicephorus*; and, after his Death, designed for his Place, by the Empress *Theodora*: But he refused to accept that Dignity. He wrote the Life of *St. Dionysius* [the *Areopagite*.] and made a Panegyrick in Honour of the Holy [Archangels and] Angels: In which, after he hath invoked them, and distinguished their several Orders, he speaks of their good Offices, which they perform to Men, and relates several Examples to prove it out of Holy Scripture. Lastly, he makes several Exclamations, by Way of Encomium. There is an Hymn at the End of this Discourse, published by Father *Combesis* [in his *Antiquar. Nov.* *Tom. 1.* p. 1525.] and is found in the *Biblioth. Patrum*. The Style of it is lofty, full of great Words and affected Epithets.

Methodius, prefer'd to the Patriarchate of the Church of *Constantinople*, in 842. is also the Author of *St. Dionys's* Life, which is extant at the End of the Works of that Father [printed at *Antwerp* in 1634. *Tom. 2.* 'Tis also printed alone at *Florence*, 1516. *Paris*, 1562.] Some Fragments also of two Sermons, printed by *Gretzer* [in his *Tom. 2. de Cruce*] are attributed to him: The one is concerning the Benefit of the Death of Christ, and the Reasons why he would dye upon the Cross. The other is against those that are ashamed of the Cross of Christ. To these we may add, The Encomium of *St. Agatha*, translated into *Latin* by Father *Combesis*, in his *Biblioth. Conconat. Patr.* and is said to be in MS. in the Library of *St. Mark* at *Venice*. Some also attribute to him a Sermon upon *St. Simeon*; and another upon the *Sunday*, called *Dominica in Ramis*, [or *Palm-Sunday*, which is the *Sunday* before *Easter-day*] which Father *Combesis* hath printed among the Works of the elder *Methodius*, [who flourished in 290. at *Paris*, in 1644.] although it be very doubtful whether they be so ancient, as we have observed in speaking of the elder *Methodius*. He died in 847. [in *Balsamon's* Collection of the *Greek* Canons, we meet with some penitential Canons, attributed to *Methodius*, but the Learned judge them not to be his.]

Of the Lives and Martyrologies of the Saints.
Hilduinus Abbot of St. Medard at Soissons, of St. German and St. Dionys [near Paris] and chief Chaplain to the Emperor Lewis the Godly. He made a Reformation in the last of these Monasteries, in 829. and settled Monks there instead of the Canons, formerly there. He took Lotharius's Part against his Father, and was banished into Saxony. But he was again restor'd, and after his Restoration he wrote his Book of the *Arcopagite*, by the Command of Lewis the Godly. In it he undertakes to prove, That *Dionysius*, the Apostle of France, was the *Arcopagite*: But this Work is full of abominable Falshoods and gross Forgeries. He proves his Opinion by Records of so small Authority, that his Writing discovers the Weakness of the Cause he maintains, and his own Inability to do it. This Work was printed at Cologne in 1563. and is put by *Surinus* among the Lives of the Saints [Octob. 9.] with a Letter from Lewis the Godly to him, and his Answer. *Hilduin* dyed, according to the Opinion of some, in 838. and of others, in 842.

David Nicetas Paphlago. surnamed *Paphlago*, because he was a Bishop in Paphlagonia, altho' he was also Patriarch of Constantinople, was a great admirer of the Patriarch *Ignatius*, and wrote a long History of his Life [which is extant, with the Acts of the VIII. Council at Ingolstadt, 1604. quarto. and Tom. 8. of the Councils. p. 1179.] He hath also composed several Panegyrics, in Honour of the Apostles and other Saints [viz. St. Mark, St. Mary, St. Gregory the Divine, St. Hyacinthus, Eustathius Agapius and Theopistus] printed by Father *Combefis* in his last Continuation of the *Biblioth. Patrum* [at Paris in 1672.] His Style is elegant and pleasant; his Relations are simple and plain, without being tedious. He often turns his Speech to the Saints; he commends and makes Acclamations in their Honour, according to the Custom of his Time.

Leo the Wise, Emperor of the East, may be reckoned among the Panegyrics of the Saints. He succeeded his Father *Basilus*, in 886. and reigned till 911. He took great Pleasure in composing Sermons. *Baronius* hath published a List of 33. [ad Annum 911. numb. 3.] which are found in a MS. in the Vatican Library, *Gretzer* hath published 9. printed at Ingolstadt in 1600. and since, Father *Combefis* hath inserted 10. in the first Tom. of his *Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr.* Besides these, we have a Discourse upon the Life of St. *John Chrysostom*, among the Works of that Father [Tom. 8.] of *Savil's* Edition, and a Sermon upon St. *Nicholas* [Bishop of Myra] printed at Toulouse, in 1644. and some Predictions [viz. 17.] concerning the State of Constantinople, printed by *Codinus* [at the End of his Antiquities, at Paris, in 1655.] *Baronius* mentions other Works of *Leo*, which are in MSS. in the Vatican Library, viz. several Discourses, Moral Precepts, Riddles or Mystical Sayings, Constitutions, and [his Taſticks, or] a Treatise of the Manner of Ranging an Army in Battalia. The Sermons printed by Father *Combefis* are upon the Nativity, Purification and Annuntiation of the Virgin, Palm-Sunday, the Incarnation, the Burial, Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ; upon the Feast of Pentecost and Death of the Virgin, which he calls her Repose, maintaining, That she, as well as others, paid the last Debt to Nature, leaving us in Doubt, whether her Body was afterwards re-united to her Soul, or whether she was put into some Place to be reserved there to the General Resurrection.

Theophanes, surnamed *Cerameus* [or the Potter] Bishop of Tauromenium in Sicily, liv'd about the End of the 9th Age. He hath composed several Homilies upon the Gospels and yearly Festivals, which are printed in Greek and Latin at Paris, in 1644. *Gretzer* hath put out two upon the Cross. Another Bishop of the same Place, nam'd *Gregory*, hath composed several Homilies upon the same Subjects, but they are not yet printed.

Georgius Monachus, the Keeper of the Records of the Church of Constantinople, and afterwards Archbishop of Nicomedia, was one of *Photius's* great Friends. He composed several Homilies upon the Feasts of the Virgin, published by Father *Combefis*, in Vol. 1. of his *Auctuar. Biblioth. Patr.* They are in a copious Style, and full of common Places, of little Benefit and tedious.

Nor doth the West furnish us with fewer Historians, who wrote the Lives of the Saints of their Time, than we have seen the Eastern Empire to have done, viz.

Ludgerus, the Scholar of St. Gregory of Utrecht, having spent much Time and Labour in converting the Infidels in England and Swedeland, was made Bishop of Munster in Westphalia, in 802. He wrote the Life of his Master St. Gregory, Bishop of Utrecht, which is published by *Brower* [at Mentz, 1615.] who hath joyned with it a Relation of the Beginning of St. *Benedict's* Mission. This Life is in Tom. 2. *Sec. Benedict. III.* published by Father *Mabillon*. *Surinus* and *Bollandus* have published a Letter under *Ludgerus's* Name, dedicated to *Rixfridus* Bishop of Utrecht; which contains a Relation of the Life and Miracles of St. *Swibert* [but it is proved by *Coins*, in his *Ann. Eccl. Fran.*

ad ann. 779. n. 31. & 754. n. 78. by many Arguments, not to belong to this Author.] He died in 809. and his Life is written by *Alfridus*, the third Bishop of Munster, [Ægil or] *Ægil*, fourth Abbot of Fulda, governed that Monastery from 818. to 822. He hath written a Relation of the most eminent Actions of his Master St. *Sturmius* [his Predecessor in the Abbacy of that Monastery:] It is put out by *Brower* [at Ingolstadt in 1616.] and is also in Tom. 2. *Sec. Benedict. III.* The Life of St. *Ægil* is written by a Monk of the same Abby, named *Candidus*, and published by the same Authors.

Vasinius Boetius, Bishop of Poitiers, flourished from the Time of Lewis the Godly to the Year 830. He wrote the Life of St. *Junianus* Abbot of Mairé, which is extant in Tom. 1. *Sec. Benedict.* put out by Father *Mabillon*.

Hermenricus, a Monk of Elwangen, a Monastery in Germany, was chosen Abbot of it in 846. He wrote the Lives of St. *Magnus* and St. *Sola*, with a Dialogue about the Foundation of his Monastery. The Life of St. *Sola* was written about the Time that *Rabanus* was chosen Bishop of Mentz, about 847. It is dedicated to *Rodolphus*, a Monk of Fulda, under whom *Ermenricus* had studied. These two Lives are published by Father *Mabillon*.

Eulogius, whom some believe to have been chosen Archbishop of Toledo, suffer'd Martyrdom at Corduba in 859. in the Persecution [of the Christians in Spain] by the Sarazens. He wrote the Martyrdom of the Christians which suffered for the Faith of Jesus Christ, before him, in that City. This Treatise is intitled, *Memoriale Sanctorum* [or, an Account of the Sufferings of the Martyrs of Corduba] and is divided into three Books. Afterward he composed an Apology [or Defence] of the same Martyrs, against those who denyed them that Title and Honour, for three Reasons. 1st. Because they never did any Miracles, as the ancient Martyrs did. 2d. Because they did not suffer variety of Torments, but were put to Death presently. 3d. Because those that put them to Death, were not Idolaters, but Mahometans, who worship the true God. He answers these Objections, and continues the History of those Martyrs. These four Books are followed by an Exhortation, or Instruction, which he made in Prison, and dedicated to two Virgins, *Mary* and *Flora*, who also were Prisoners. [In which he gives all the Christians then in Bonds for Christs sake, Arguments and Encouragements to suffer constantly, and adds] a Prayer for them to use in their present Condition. He hath also composed a Writing, dedicated to [Wilifindus] Bishop of Pampelona, when he sent him some Relicks of the ancient Martyrs of Corduba, which he had desired of him, when he was at Pampelona. In it he speaks of the Persecution of the Christians of Corduba, and sets down the Names of the Martyrs, and the days of their death. He sent his Instruction to *Flora*, and his Memoir of the Martyrs to his Brother *Alvarus*, who was then in Banishment in Germany, and wrote two Letters to him about the same matter, which *Alvarus* answered. Afterwards he sent him an Account of the Martyrdom of those two Virgins, as he did also to *Baldegofena*, *Flora's* Sister. We have these Letters, with the Works of *Eulogius*, in the *Biblioth. Patr.* [Tom. 15. p. 242.] and in the 4. Tome of the Spanish Writers [p. 213.] *Ambrosius Morales* also hath printed all together with his own Notes at Complutum in 1554. [which was the first Edition of *Eulogius's* Works, but *Maluenda* finds fault with it, because he hath left out several things concerning *Mahomet* and his Doctrines, in the first and second Books of his Memoir of the Martyrs, which *Eulogius* had written. Wherefore *Poncius Leo* put out a more correct Edition at the same place in 1574. but continued *Morales's* Notes.] *Surinus* also hath printed his Lives of the Martyrs of Corduba.

Alvarus, Brother of *Eulogius* hath written, besides the Answers to his Brother *Eulogius's* Letters before-mentioned [which are among *Eulogius's* Letter's] the History of his Brother's Martyrdom [which is prefixed before *Eulogius's* Works in the *Complutensian* last Edition, and in the *Biblioth. Patr.* and *Surinus March II.* *Vossius* attributes to this Author two other Treatises, viz. *Scintille Patrum*, which is a Collection of Moral Sentences out of the Fathers and *Indiculus Luminosus*, but they are not yet commonly received for his by learned Men.]

Herrius or *Errius*, born at a Village of the same Name, *Herrius* viz. *Hery*, two Leagues from Auxerre, was a Benedictine Monk of the Abby of St. Germans in that City. He had for his Masters *Haymo* [of Halberstadt] and *Lupus* of Fer-rara, as he himself tells us in the Preface to his Collection of Maxims and Things remarkable, taken out of the Holy Fathers and other ancient Writers, dedicated to *Hildebal* Bishop of Auxerre, of which we have only the Preface in Tom. 7. of *Mabillon's* *Antecd.* Besides this Work, he composed two Books in Prose concerning the Miracles of St. German Bishop of Auxerre, printed by Father *Labbe* in the first Tome of *Biblioth. MSS.* Six Books also in Verse, containing the Life of *Casarius*, undertaken by the order of *Lotharius* the younger and dedicated to *Carolus Calus*,

printed at Paris [in 1543. *Octavo.*] with the Poem of *Marius Victorinus* upon *Genesis*. He undertook to compose an History of the Bishop of *Auxerre*, with *Rainogalus* and *Alo-*
Martyrologius, Canons of that Church. He made also [many] Ho-
 gies of the milies, of which we have three among the Homilies of
 Saints. *Paulus Diaconus*.

Anscharius, a Monk of *Corby*, the Apostle of *Denmark*
 and those Northern Countries, and after made Bishop of
 us, a Monk *Hamburg* and *Breme*, hath written the Life of *Willibadus*
 of Corby. first Bishop of *Breme*, which was printed at *Antwerp* in
 1642. and in the second part of *Father Mabillon's Sac.*
Bened. III. *Anscharius* went into *Denmark* in 836. and was
 made Bishop of *Hamburg* in 842. and the Bishoprick of
Breme was added to it in 849. He died in 865. [*Ansch-*
arius's Psalter is extant in *Cranzius Metrop.* l. i. c. 42. but
 his Epistles, of which he wrote many, are lost.]

Rudolphus or *Rudolphus*, a Scholar of *Rabanus*, a Priest
 and Monk of *Fulda*, the Preacher, and Confessor to *Lewis*
 King of *Germany*, passed for a very learned Man for his
 time. In the Annals of *Fulda* he hath given him the Title
 of an excellent Historian and Poet, and of a Man very
 well vers'd in all humane Sciences. He writ the Lives of
Rabanus and *St. Lioba*, *Abbesni* of *Priscofthen*, which are in
Father Mabillon's Sac. Bened. and in *Surius* and *Bollan-*
dus's Acts of the Lives of the Saints. The last of these
 Lives was composed out of the Records and Collections of
 a Priest named *Mago*, who had conversed with four of the
 Scholars of *St. Lioba* [viz. *Agatha*, *Thecla*, *Nana*, and *Eoli-*
ba.] This Author died in 865.

Ifo, a Monk of *St. Gallus*, wrote about the Year 860.
 two Books containing the Lives and Miracles of *St. Oth-*
marus, Abbot of *St. Gallus*, which are also put out in *Tom.*
 II. *Sac. Ben.* III. He died in 871.

Alfridus and *Orthegrius*, of which the first was Bishop of
Munster, and the other Monk of *Werthin*, have each of them
 written the Life of *St. Ludgerus* the first Bishop of *Munster*.
 They are both printed in *Sac. Bened.* *Alfridus* was the
 third Bishop of *Munster* after *Ludgerus*, succeeding to *Jes-*
frey the Nephew of this Saint in 839. and died in 849.
Orthegrius or *Hildegrinus*, wrote before him.

Ermentarius, Abbot of *Noicmontier*, wrote an History of
 the Translation of the Body of *St. Philibert*, which the
 Monks of the Abby were forced to carry into several places,
 to keep it from the burning of the *Normans*. 'Tis pub-
 lished by *Father Chiffetius*, and since by *Father Mabillon*.

Milo, called *Sigebert*, a Monk of *St. Amandus*, hath com-
 posed in Verse, the Life of that Saint, and a Treatise of
 Sobriety, dedicated to King *Charles*. We have this Life of
Amandus, divided into four parts, with a Supplement to
 another Life of the same Saint, and the History of the
 Translation of his Relicks, in the Acts of *Bollandus*. *Sur-*
ius hath published an Homily under his Name upon the
 Life of *Principius* Bishop of *Soissons*. *Father Audin* hath
 published a piece, in Verse, of this Author's, which is a
 Dialogue between the Spring and Winter. [He died in
 872. and is buried in his Monastery. His Epitaph celebrates
 him for the Author of his Treatise of Sobriety and Life
 of *Amandus*.]

Aimonius, of whom we are speaking in this Paragraph,
 is a different Person from the Author of the History of *France*.
 This last was a Monk of *St. German de Prez*, the other
 was the Abbot of *Fleury*. The one wrote at the end of
 the 9th. Age, and the other at the beginning of the 11th.
 This, of whom we are speaking, hath described the finding
 and Translation [of the Body] of *St. Vincent*, and made
 two Books upon the Miracles of *St. German* Bishop of
Paris. A Book upon the Translation of the Martyrs *St.*
George the Monk, *St. Aurelius* and *St. Natalia*, and two
 Books of their Miracles. These Works are printed by *Fa-*
ther Mabillon in *Sac. Bened.* [33 and 34.] and in other
 Collections [viz. *Surius*, *July*, 25. &c.]

We must distinguish the two *Abbo's* as well as the two
Aimonius's. The first was a Monk of *St. German de Prez*
 [or *de Pratis*] as well as the first *Aimonius*, and lived at the
 same time with him; the other was co-temporary with the se-
 cond *Aimonius*, and a Monk of the same Abby of *Fleury*.
 This last is the Author of a Poem divided into two Books,
 containing the History of the Siege of *Paris* by the *Normans*,
 in 836, and 887. This Work is dedicated to *Goscelinus*
 (not the Bishop of *Paris*, but a Deacon of the same name)
 and hath been printed several times in the Collections of
 the French Historians. He hath a third Book, which is not
 yet printed. This Author hath made some Sermons, which
 are in MS. at *St. German de Prez*, of which *Father Da-*
cherius hath chosen out five, and printed them in *Tom. 9.*
Spicil. with an Advertisement to the Reader, in which he
 says, that he made these Sermons at the request of *Frotari-*
us Bishop of *Poitiers* and *Fulradus* Bishop of *Paris*, that
 the Clergy might make use of them to instruct the ig-
 norant Laity. Four of these Sermons are upon Holy *Thurs-*
day. In them *Abbo* observes, that this was the day on
 which *Jesus Christ* celebrated the Passover with his Disci-
 ples, and gave them the sacred Memorials of his Body and
 Blood; that the Bishops consecrate the Holy Oyl and the

Altars, and the Pavements of the Churches are washed,
 and those Penitents absolved and received to communion, Of the
 who had been excommunicated at the beginning of Lent. Lives and
 And upon this last Point it is that he chiefly enlarges in Martyrolo-
 those Sermons, exhorting the Penitents to turn unto God gies of the
 with all their Hearts, that they may receive the benefit of Saints.
 Absolution, to renounce their Sins, and lead a Christian
 Life for the future. The third is addressed to the Penitents
 before their Absolution. He comforts them under the de-
 lays of Absolution, telling them, that the Bishop can't ab-
 solve them till they have performed their Penance, and
 shewed a real sorrow for their Sins. *Nullus est certe Epis-*
copus, qui possit absolutionem dare, nisi post poenitentiam factam,
& dignam satisfactionem. He exhorts them earnestly to ob-
 serve the Lent-Fast. The fourth is directed to the absol-
 ved Penitents. He compares the state they were in before
 Reconciliation to that they are now in, and exhorts them
 not to make their Repentance of no advantage to them,
 by relapsing into their Sins. The last Sermon is upon the
 settlement of the Christian Religion, whose excellency he
 commends by the price it cost. For the sake of this it was
 that *Jesus Christ* died and rose again, that the Apostles la-
 boured and suffered so much, that so many just Men have
 been martyred, that so many Confessors have given such
 Examples of Virtue, and dispersed that Light in the World;
 that so many Men have recreated into Monasteries, found-
 ed and establish'd by the piety of the Kings and Princes
 of the Earth. This gives him an occasion to inveigh against
 those, that take away the Revenues of Churches and Mo-
 nasteries. He comforts the Christians that suffered Wrongs,
 and shews them, that they ought to content themselves
 with a few worldly Things, and labour for a Celestial
 Treasure, where these Extortioners, which spoil the Church,
 the *Normans*, who plunder and rob to enrich themselves,
 must expect the Torments of Hell.

Wolfardus, or *Wolfadus*, a Priest and Monk of *Hatennede*,
 in the Diocese of *Eicstat*, composed, about the end of the
 9th. Age the Life of *St. Walpurga*, and dedicated it to
Erkenwald Bishop of *Eicstat* [by whose Command he made
 them], and three Books of Miracles of that Holy Woman.
 He promised a Dialogue concerning that Saint, which we
 have not. Other of his Books are printed in the Collecti-
 ons of *Canisius*, *Bollandus*, and *Father Mabillon*.

Hughaldus [*Huchaldus* or *Hubaldus*] the Nephew and *Hugal-*
 Scholar of *Milo*, a Monk of *St. Amandus*, flourished in the dus a Monk
 9th. Age, and was very long-lived. He was accounted a of *St. A-*
 Man of great Learning in his time. He made a Poem of mandus.
 300 Verses, dedicated to *Charles* the Bald, in commendati-
 on of Baldness, of which almost all the Verses begin with
 the Letter C. But 'tis not for the sake of this Work [tho'
 it hath been thought worth the printing at *Basil* in 1516.
 and 1546. and at *Frankfort* in 1624.] that we mention this
 Author; nor for the sake of his Book of Musick [spoken
 of by *Sigebert*] but because he composed the Lives of *St.*
Aldegondes Abbess of *Malbod*, *St. Rictrudes* Abbess of *Mar-*
chieme, and *St. Leuwin*, a Priest, printed by *Surius* and
Bollandus on May 12. and *Mabillon* [*Sac. Bened.* II.]
Sigebert speaks of this Author, and attributes to him the
 Lives of several other Saints, [in his Book *De Script. Cap.*
 108.]

Alfredus, or *Elfridus* [or *Aluredus*] King of *England*, *Alfredus*
 was sent by his Father *Ethelwolf*, [King of the West Sax- King of
 ons] to *Rome*, where he was crowned in the Year 872, by England.
 Pope *Leo IV.* He was a great lover of learning and learn-
 ed Men; He translated several Latin Authors into the
 Saxon Tongue, and published them in his own Name, viz.
Bede's History of England, *Paulus Orosius's History*, *St.*
Gregory's Pastoral, &c. He composed some Laws. The
 Saxon Translation of *Bede's History* was printed at *Cam-*
bridge in 1644, with his Laws and Prefaces to *St. Gregory's*
Pastoral and *P. Orosius*. His Laws also are inserted in
Spelman's Councils, and in the 9th. Tome of the Councils,
 p. 582. The 1st. commands the payments of Tythes. The
 2d. is against those that rob Churches. The other are a-
 bout Civil matters. This King died in the Year 900. *Fa-*
ther Collet hath published his Will [out of *Asserius Mene-*
vensis.]

Rembertus, Archbishop of *Breme*, wrote the Life of his *Rember-*
 Predecessor *Anscharius*, printed at *Cologne*, with the Lives tus, Arch-
 of the other Bishops of that Church. 'Tis also in the Col- bishop of
 lections of *Bollandus* and *Father Mabillon*. *Rembertus* was Breme-
 chosen Bishop after the Death of *Anscharius*, in 865. and
 died in 888.

Herembert, [or *Erchempert*.] a Monk of *Mount Cassin*, *Herem-*
 lived at the end of the 9th. Age; he made a Chronicon, bertus, a
 printed at *Naples*, in 1626, by the care of *Caracciolus* a Monk of
 Theatin Priest.

Almannus, a Monk of *Hautevilliers* in the Diocese of *Cassin*,
Rheims, compiled at the request of *Theodonus* his Bishop, the *Almannus*
 Life of *St. Memnus* the first Bishop of *Chalons*. *Father a Monk of*
Mabillon in *Tome 2. Analect.* hath put out a Letter of that *Hautevil-*
 Bishop to him, and his Answer with an Extract of the Re- liers.
 gister for Burials in the Abby of *Hautevilliers*; which shew
 that this Author made the Lamentations of *France* ravaged
 by

by the Normans, and the Lives of St. Nivard Archbishop of Rheims, Sindulphus a Recluse and Priest, the Empress St. Helena, and the History of the Translation of her Relicks [from Rome] to the Monastery of Hautevilliers, with several other Works.

Adelinus, [or Adelelinus, or Adelmus] succeeded Hildebrand in the Bishoprick of Secz after 877, and govern'd that Church till the Year 910. He wrote the Life of St. Opporuna the Abbess, Sister of Godegrand the first Bishop of Secz. It was published by Surius, Bollandus, in April 22, and by Father Mabillon in Tome 2. Sac. Benedict. III.

Otfredus, a Benedictine Monk of the Abby of Weiffenburg, and Scholar of Rabanus, compos'd an History of the Gospel in the Teutonick Tongue, that the People that did not understand the Greek nor Latin, might read and understand the Gospel. He divided this Work into five Books, which contain'd the principal circumstances of the Life of Jesus Christ, taken out of the four Evangelists, and digested into the order of Time. He dedicated it to Luctbertus Archbishop of Mentz, by a Latin Letter which he used instead of a Preface; it is printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum; but the Work it self is not yet made Publick. Trithemius makes mention of some other Treatises of this Author, dedicated to King Lewis, Bishop Solomon, and the Monks of St. Gallus. Three Volumes upon the Psalms; a Treatise of the last Judgment; another of the Joys of Heaven, several Letters, and many pieces of Poetry.

Aldrevaldus [Aldelbertus] and Albertus, a Monk of Fleury lived towards the end of the 9th. Age. He wrote an History of the Translation of St. Benedict and St. Scholastica, and a Book of the Miracles of St. Benedict. These works are in the Library of the Monastery of Fleury.

Afferius, [Menevensis] Bishop of [Sherburn in] England, flourished about 890, and died in 909. He wrote the History of the Acts of Alfredus his King, which was printed in 1602. at Francfort, with other English Historians; [Bale says he wrote the Annals of England, some Homilies, and some other Works, but we have them not. He is accounted an Author of good Credit.]

We must not forget the Martyrologies which were perfected in this Age. In the beginning of the last Century, venerable Bede took much pains in this matter, and made two Martyrologies, the one in Prose, the other in Verse, but both of them being Imperfect, Florus a Deacon of the Church of Lyons, made several Additions to Bede's Martyrology, in the Age we are speaking of, and put it almost into that form it is at present in, as is observed by Bollandus, who hath published the true Martyrology of Bede, with Florus's Additions, in his 2d. Tome of March.

Wandalbert, a Deacon and Monk of Prom, a Monastery in the Diocess of Treves, compos'd about the Year 850, a Martyrology, in [Heroick] Verse, taken out of Bede and Florus. Sigebert and Trithemius make mention of him. It has been printed under the name of Bede at the end of Bede's Ephemerides in the Basil Edition, and afterwards by Molanus at the end of Usuardus's Martyrology. But Father Dacherius hath printed it more exact and correct in Tome 3. Spicileg.

About the same time also Rabanus compos'd a Martyrology, published by Canisius, in the 6. Tome of his Ecclesiastical Antiquities.

After him Ado, Archbishop of Vienna, compos'd a Work of the same nature more exact than any of the former: He modeled it by an ancient Martyrology, which he found at Aquileia, brought thither from Rome, which contained the Names, Qualities, and various Torments of the Saints that suffer'd Martyrdom. He hath put at the beginning of his Martyrology, a small Tract of the Festivals of the Apostles, in which he writes the History of their Martyrdom. The same Author hath made a short Chronology from the be-

ginning of the World to the Birth of Charles the Simple, the Son of Lewis the Stammerer, which was in 879. of our Account. He divides the duration of the World into six Ages; The 1st. is from the Creation of the World to the Flood. The 2d. from the Flood to the Birth of Abraham. The 3d. from Abraham to David. The 4th. from David to the Captivity in Babylon. The 5th. from the Captivity to the Birth of our Saviour. And the 6th. from the Nativity of Jesus Christ to the end of the World. This Chronology is printed with the Works of Gregory Bishop of Tours at Paris, in 1512, and 1567, and at Basil 1568, [and by it self at Paris in 1522.] It is also inserted in the Biblioth. Patr. [Tome 16. p. 768.] His Martyrology is published by Lippomannus in the Lives of the Fathers; and after by Bollandus in his Supplement to Surius, and last of all by Rosweidus, who first printed the ancient Martyrology which Ado had put before his Works [at Antwerp in 1613. and at Paris in 1645.] There are also two Lives which bear the name of Ado; the one is of Desiderius Archbishop of Vienna, put out by Canisius in his Antiquities; and the other is of St. Theuderius an Abbot of the same City, published by Father Mabillon in Tome 1. of his Sac. Benedict. Some think this Author died in 814. which makes some say, that he added some Years to his Chronology; but to me it seems not probable. It is most agreeable to Truth to fix his death a little after 879.

Lastly, Usuardus a Monk of St. Germans de Prez, (a) hath compos'd a Martyrology more considerable than any of the former, under the Reign of the Emperor (b) Charles the Bald, to whom he dedicated it in 870. This Work being much larger, and more perfect than any that were written before upon the same Subject, was much approved and well accepted in all Churches which began to make use of it in their Offices. Some think also that the Church of Rome took it into their Services and used it, before they had one of their own. This Martyrology hath been printed at Antwerp in 1538. and at Louvain in 1568. [with Molanus's Notes and Additions] and since in several other places [as Antwerp 1583. with Hissel's Censure; but all that was displeasing to the Papists, is left out of this Edition, as Usher tells us in his Biblioth. Theol. MS.]

To these Authors might have been added Gildas, who made a Kalendar of the Saints, of which Bishop Usher hath printed the Preface, [in Epist. Heb. Syll. p. 55.] and some other Authors of the 9th. Age, which are purposely omitted, as well as some Historical matters of little or no Consequence, which we could not think necessary to put into this Work; for it is not our design to make compleat Annals Year by Year, but only to explain the most important Matters treated of in this Age, which is the principal and most profitable part of Ecclesiastical History; for in that our particular Enquiry ought not to be after a meer Narration of Matters of Fact, which is of little use, but what concerns the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church, and upon Questions and Works of that nature it is that we have chiefly insisted: that our Reader may have a competent knowledge of them, we shall account it a very great happiness, if this Work may be serviceable in any measure to clear the difficult Questions, and confirm the important Doctrines of the Christian Religion. But how severe so ever others Censures may be upon it, it will be always some comfort to us that we have laboured in and aimed at so good a Design; and we hope that though our pains may not have the wish'd for Effect among Men, yet it shall be of some real advantage to us with him who knows and rewards the good Intentions as well as the good Actions of Men, according to the words of St. Bernard Ep. 360. Laboravimus, quantum potuimus, & si quo minus impetravimus, quod optavimus, manet tamen fructus Laboris nostri, apud Deum, apud quem nullum bonum irremuneratum est in fine.

(a) A Monk of St. Germans.] Some make him the Abbot of Fulda, and others the Abbot of St. Saviours, but it is evident that he was a Monk of St. Germans, by an ancient Manuscript of that Abby. Some call him Isuard (b) Charles the Bald] His Book was dedicated to Charles, some have thought it was to Charles the Great; but Aimonius a Monk of St. Germans, in his Translation of the Martyrs, Gregory, Aurelius, &c. observes, that Usuard lived in 858, and we find in that Martyrology, the

names of Eulogius and other Martyrs that suffer'd in Spain, in 857. In an ancient Manuscript of this Martyrology which may be thought the Original, we find the Death of Queen Hermetruda set down in the first place, and Charles in the second, which shews that 'twas Written after the Year 869. in which the Queen died, and before 875, in which the death of Charles the Bald happened.

C H A P. I.

An Account of the most Considerable Transactions in the Eastern Church, during the Tenth Century.

Of the Transactions in the Eastern Church, during the Tenth Century.

Leo the Philosopher Emperor of the East. The Disturbances which happen'd in the Eastern Churches upon the account of Leo's 4th Marriage.

Nicholas the Patriarch of Constantinople is banish'd.

Nicholas is re-join'd.

The Letters of Nicholas Patriarch of Constantinople to the Pope and Legats.

The re-union of the Clergy of Constantinople.

The Patriarchs of Constantinople who succeeded Nicholas.

At the beginning of this Century, *Leo* the Philosopher, one of the most learned Emperors the Greeks ever had, govern'd the Empire of the East. This Prince having had three Wives successively, and no Issue Male by either of them, being desirous of a Son to succeed him, marries a fourth Wife, by name *Zoe*, by whom he already had a Son before the Nuptials. But a third Marriage being prohibited in the East, and *Leo* himself having enacted a Law against such as should contract such a Marriage, *Nicholas* the Patriarch of Constantinople, refuses to marry this Prince to this fourth Wife, deposes Presbyter *Thomas* who ventur'd to do it, and excommunicates the Emperor himself. *Leo* had recourse to the Pope for his Approbation of the Marriage; and because such successive Marriages (how often soever contracted) were tolerated in the West, he easily obtain'd from Pope *Sergius* the point he desired. This Pope sent his Legats into the East to confirm the Marriage of *Leo*; but the Patriarch of Constantinople would not give the least ground, nor acknowledge the Emperor's Marriage as valid, or his Son *Constantine Porphyrogeneta* as lawful Heir to the Crown. The Emperor did all he could to change his Mind, but finding him fix'd in his Resolution, he banish'd him in the beginning of the Year 901. and plac'd in his Room *Euthymius*, who held the Patriarchal See of Constantinople 'till about the end of *Leo's* Reign: For *Nicholas* himself assures us, that this Prince, touch'd with the remorse of what he had done, recall'd him from his Exile, and re-establish'd him a little before his Death: In which matter he is rather to be credited, than those Authors who tell us that he was recall'd by *Alexander* the Brother of *Leo*, which happen'd after the Death of this Prince, in the Year 911. the time when he was declar'd Governor to *Constantine Porphyrogeneta*. Let it be how it will, *Euthymius* fell into disgrace, and was banish'd, and dy'd shortly after: And *Nicholas's* Interest so far prevail'd, that after the Death of *Alexander*, who did not out-live his Brother above thirteen Months, he was cholen Tutor of the Young Emperor. It was at this time, that he wrote a long Letter to the Pope, acquainting him of the whole Contest with the Emperor *Leo* about his last Marriage, and stiffly maintain'd, contrary to the Practice and Opinion of the Church of Rome, that to marry a third or fourth time was absolutely unlawful. But the Patriarch having received no answer from Rome, wrote another to Pope *John*, wherein he offers to observe a fair Correspondence and Union with the Holy See, provided he would own that a fourth Marriage was not to be permitted to the Emperor, unless by way of Indulgence or Consideration of his Royal Person, and that in it self it was unlawful. The same Patriarch wrote several other Letters, viz. to *Simeon* Prince of Bulgaria, recommending the Legats which the Pope sent him: One to the Prince of Armenia, upon the Conversion of several Armenians, who had abandoned their Errors: another to the Prince of the Sarazens, to dissuade him from persecuting the Christians: One wrote from the Place of his Exile to the Bishops, who had own'd *Euthymius* for their Patriarch, and two other Letters of Compliment, one to the Prince of Lombardy, and the other to the Prince of the Amalphitans. The Empress *Zoe*, who had taken the Government into her own hands, and had expell'd the Patriarch *Nicholas* from Court in the Year 914. was her self divested of her Authority in the Year 919. and thrust into the Monastery of Saint *Euphemia*, by *Patricius Romanus*, whom *Constantine* had made his Partner in the Throne. Hitherto the Clergy of Constantinople were divided into two Parties, one declaring for *Nicholas*, the other for *Euthymius*; but were re-united in the Year 920. and made a Treaty of Union in an Ecclesiastical Convocation, by which (without disannulling any thing that was past) they absolutely prohibited for the future a fourth Marriage, under the pain of Excommunication to be inflict'd on those who should contract such a Marriage, and to be in force during the continuance of such Marriage. They likewise inflict'd a Penance of five Years on such as should marry a third time being above forty years old: And a Penance of three Years on such as should re-marry after thirty Years of Age, if they had any Children by their former Marriages.

By this Regulation was the Church of Constantinople restor'd to its former Quiet, the Peaceable possession of which *Nicholas* enjoy'd to his Death, which happen'd in the Year 930. *Stephen* the Archbishop of Amasea was his Successor, who presided over this Church almost three Years. After his Death the Patriarchal See of Constantinople was design'd for *Theophilact* the Emperor's Son; but he being under age,

this Dignity was repos'd by way of Trust in the hands of one *Tripbo* a Monk. He being once in possession refus'd to resign his Place to *Theophilact*; but the Emperor made use of one, who cunningly procur'd a Blank Paper sign'd by the Patriarch's own hand, which he fill'd up with a Resignation of the Patriarchship, as acknowledging himself unworthy of it. Whereupon he was depos'd in a Synod held at Constantinople in the Year 944. and *Theophilact* was constituted in his place. But this Man led a Life far different from what a Patriarch ought to lead, and was more taken up with his Horses and his Hounds, and other such like Diversions, than with discharging the Duty of his Place. He died in the Year 956. of a Dropsie, occasioned by a fall off his Horse, which flung him against a Wall. The Emperor constituted in his Room *Polyeucta*, a poor Monk, but one of extraordinary good Morals, who was Ordain'd by *Basil* Bishop of *Cesarea*, and not by *Nicephorus* of *Heraclea*, to whom that Ordination did of Right belong. The liberty which this Patriarch took of reproving the Great Men at Court, immediately drew upon him a great many Enemies, who inclin'd the Emperor to think of deposing him. He was confirm'd in this Resolution by *Theodorus* of *Cizica*, but notwithstanding he was so bent upon it, he died without doing any thing therein. His Son *Romanus*, who was suppos'd to give his Father a Lift into the other world, succeeded him in the Year 960. and caus'd his Son *Basil* to be Crown'd by *Polyeucta*. But this young Prince and his Brother *Constantine*, not being of age to enter upon the Government when their Father died in the Year 963. *Nicephorus Phocas* was proclaim'd Emperor by the Army, and Crown'd by *Polyeucta*. A while after this Patriarch had a warm debate with the Emperor: For this Emperor having marry'd *Theophanes*, the Widow of *Romanus*, *Polyeucta* threaten'd to excommunicate him unless he would Renounce her: (1.) Because this was the second Marriage *Nicephorus* had contracted, without submitting to the Penance due to those who were Guilty of Bigamy. (2.) Because it was reported that *Nicephorus* had flood God-father to one of *Theophanes's* Children, the Emperor propos'd this Question to the Bishops, who were then in Constantinople, and to the chief of his Council, who left him at his Liberty to keep *Theophanes* as his Wife: And *Polyeucta* himself did not insist any more on the Dissolution of the Marriage, after that the Emperor had assur'd him upon his Oath, that he had never flood God-father to any of *Theophanes's* Children, which was confirm'd by *Stylien*, chief Secretary of State, who made a Recantation of what he had formerly said about it. This Emperor began his Reign with Success, and re-took a great many Provinces of Asia from the Sarazens; but he loaded his People with Taxes, and seiz'd upon the Revenues of the Church to give to his Soldiers. After the Death of any Bishops he would send a Commissary to seize upon their Temporalities, and prohibited the chusing any others in their stead, without his consent and orders, which was confirm'd in a Synod. At the same time he would fain have had a Ratification of this Proposal, "That all Soldiers who died in the Field, should be declared Saints as the Martyrs were; but the Bishops oppos'd it. However, they could not persuade two of their Brethren who had born Arms, and fought against the Enemy, to relinquish their Ministerial Functions; several amongst them of a more Martial Genius approving of this their Conduct. The exactions of *Nicephorus*, and the bad success of his Arms in Italy, having render'd him Odious to the People of Constantinople, he was kill'd in an Insurrection of them, and *John Sinaid*, *Zemisces*, Reign'd in his stead in the Year 969. *Polyeucta* refus'd to Crown him, till he had banish'd the Murderers of *Nicephorus*, sent *Theophanes* from Court, and promis'd to give to the poor, as an Expiation of his fault, the Estate which he had when a private Man. This was the last Action of *Polyeucta*, who dy'd five and thirty days after he had Crown'd this Prince, in the beginning of the Year 970. having held the Patriarchal See of Constantinople fourteen Years. *Basil* the Monk succeeded him, who had the Government of that Church 'till the Death of *John Zemisces*, which happen'd, about the Year 975. or 976. after which the two Sons of *Romanus* being upon the Throne, and having re-call'd their Mother *Theophanes*, *Basil* the Patriarch was depos'd in Council, and *Anthony Studita* succeeded him. But he did not enjoy the Patriarchship long; for the Year after *Bardus*, surnamed the Hard, having revolted and taken upon him the Quality and Ensigns of Emperor, *Anthony* of his own accord quit- ted his place and withdrew. The See of Constantinople became Vacant during four Years, the time he surviv'd.

After

Of the Transactions in the Eastern Church, during the Tenth Century.

Theophilact an unworthy Patriarch of Constantinople. Polyeucta Patriarch of Constantinople.

Nicephorus Phocas Emperor.

John Zemisces Emperor.

The death of Polyeucta. Basil put in his place.

Anthony Studita Patriarch of Constantinople.

After his Death *Nicholas*, surnamed *Chrysoberge*, succeeded, who had *Sisinnius* for his Successor in the year 993. *Basil* and *Constantine*, who had subdued *Bardus*, reign'd still as Emperors. *Basil* lived in the year 1025. and his Brother *Constantine* liv'd three years after him.

During this whole Century, the *Greek Church*, which was

upon its Declension, proved very barren, both of famous Men and good Authors. We find among them but very few who made it their Business to compose, and their Works are very inconsiderable, both in Respect to the Matter, and to the Manner wherein they were writ.

Simeon Metaphrastes.

ONE of those who wrote most was *Simeon*, surnam'd *Metaphrastes*, so call'd from his turning the ancient Lives of the Saints into another sort of a Style than that wherein they were formerly written. He was an Officer in the Palace, Lord High Chancellor, and flourish'd in the Tenth Century, chiefly under the Reign of *Constantine Porphyrogenneta*. For tho' he had been employ'd under the Reign of *Leo*, yet he writ nothing till *Constantine's* Time, as appears by the Life of *St. Theodistia*, which is his first Piece, as is observ'd in his *Panegyrick* written by *Psellus*, another *Psellus* than that who liv'd in the Time of *Constantine* the *Iconoclast*, of whom we spoke in another Place. He apply'd himself to study, and enquire into the Lives of the Saints, and having made a large Collection of them, those which he did not like he undertook to make over again, not only by casting them into a different Style, but also by adding to, or subtracting from them, what he thought convenient, and running them down into the Form of a *Panegyrick* rather than History. We have a great many of them of his composing, and most under his Name, as well in printed Collections as in MSS. but they are mix'd with several others, compos'd by various Authors. There are some among the Anonymous which may be ascribed to him. It would be very difficult to make the Distinction, had not the ingenious *Allatius* given himself the Trouble of doing it, with a great deal of Accuracy, in his Differ-

tation concerning the Writings of the *Simeons*, wherein he gives us a Catalogue of the Lives of the Saints, which, in Manuscript or Print, belong properly to *Metaphrastes*, and which of them belong to other Authors. He reckons above an hundred which are genuin, and almost as many more that are spurious, whose Authors are unknown; and near four hundred and fifty whose Authors he discovers. They who have the Curiosity to search further into this Matter, may consult *Allatius* himself: As for our Part, we don't think it worth our while to croud such a tedious and useless Catalogue into our Work. Besides these Lives of the Saints, *Metaphrastes* has compos'd several Sermons on the solemn Festivals of the Year, which are to be met with in Manuscripts; and a great many Hymns and Prayers which are inserted in the Ecclesiastical Writings of the *Greeks*. He likewise digested four and twenty moral Discourses taken from the Works of *St. Basil*, and printed together with them, [and likewise publish'd by themselves in *Greek* at *Paris*, 1556.] And in the Libraries there are a great many Collections of moral Sentences taken out of *St. Macarius*, and an hundred one and thirty Sentences or Rules more, all compos'd by *Metaphrastes*. Lastly, *Leo Allatius* has publish'd nine Letters and several Pieces of Poetry of the same Author, together with a Discourse of the Lamentation of the Virgin *Mary* on the Passion of our Saviour.

John Cameniates.

ABOUT the same Time liv'd *John Cameniates*, Lecturer of the Church of *Theffalonica*, who wrote the History of the taking and sacking that City by the *Sarazens* in the

Year 904. It was set forth by *Leo Allatius* in his Collection of the *Greek Writers*.

Constantine Porphyrogenneta.

Constantine Porphyrogenneta is reckon'd one of the Authors of this Century. He was ingenious himself, a Lover of learned Men, and very well vers'd in the Sciences. We have of his Writing an History of the Image of our Saviour sent to *Agharus* King of *Edessa*, and brought from *Edessa* to *Constantinople* in the Year 944. This Piece was publish'd by *Father Combefis*, in his Collection of the Authors who wrote the History of *Constantinople*, and printed at *Paris*, 1664. He likewise wrote the Life of his Grand-Father the Emperor *Basil the Macedonian*; which is to be met with in the Collection of *Allatius*. In the Year 1617. *Meursius* set forth several Political

Treatises of this Emperor's composing, viz. A Treatise concerning the Government of the Empire, directed to his Son *Romanus*; a Book of Institutions, two Books of the Dignities of the Eastern Empire, and seventeen Novels. He likewise compos'd several Historical and Political Pandects, extracted out of all the Historians, and rang'd under three and fifty Heads, of which we have only two remaining, viz. the 27th. which contains the Extracts of *Embassies*, published in *Greek* by *Hoeschelius*, printed at *Ausbourg* in the Year 1633. and in *Latin* at *Paris*, in the Year 1609. And the 50th. on the Virtues and Vices, set forth by *Monfieur Henry de Valois*, and printed at *Paris*, in the Year 1634.

Hippolitus the Theban.

Hippolitus the Theban lived in the same Century. He compos'd a *Chronicon*, several Fragments whereof are to be met with in the third Tome of the Antiquities of *Canisius*, and in *Monsieur Cotelier's*

Notes. 'Tis to this *Hippolitus* that we ought to attribute the small Treatise of the twelve Apostles set forth by *Father Combefis*, in the second Tome of his Additions to the *Bibl. Patrum*, [printed at *Paris* in the Year 1648.]

Eutichius Patriarch of Alexandria.

Eutichius the Egyptian, of the Country call'd *Said* in *Egypt*, born in the Year 876. by Profession a Physician, and Patriarch of *Alexandria* from the Year 933. to the Year 940. compos'd several Treatises in *Arabick*. Those which have been transmitted to our Times, are a Treatise of Physick, a Dispute between an Heretick and a Christian, an History of *Sicily* from the Time of the taking of that Island by the *Sarazens*, and Annals from the Beginning of the World down to the Year 937. containing several remarkable Transactions both of Ecclesiastical and Prophane History, and which he has intitled, *A Methodical Disposition, or Composition of precious Things, or the Sub-*

stance, or Marrow of History. *Selden* in the Year 1642. printed at *London*, a Fragment of his Treatise concerning the Election and Ordination of the first Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, which *Eutichius* asserts had been done till *Alexander's* Time, by twelve Presbyters of that Church, who chose one among themselves for Patriarch, and laid their Hands upon him. He likewise there maintains, that there was not a Bishop in all *Egypt* till the Time of *Demetrius*. This very Treatise has since that been published entire by *Selden*, and printed in the Year 1658. at *London*, in two Vol. in 4to. both in *Arabick* and in *Latin*. 'Tis full of Fables and very vulgar Stories.

Nico of Armenia.

NICO of *Armenia* was very young, when without his Parents Consent he shut himself up in the Monastery of the *Golden Rock*, situate between *Pontus* and *Paphlagonia*. After he had there led for a long Time a very austere Life, in the Year 961. he was sent out on a Mission by his Superior. He preached in *Ar-*

menia, and in other Provinces of the East, and from thence went to the Isle of *Crete*, which had lately shaken off the Yoke of the *Sarazens*. He purg'd this Island from those Pagan Superstitions which were still in Use among them, and brought over a great many Persons to the Faith. He retir'd afterwards to *Lacedemonia*, from whence he was sent

for to *Corinth*, by his Prayers to put a Stop to the Incur-
Nico of sions of the *Bulgarians*. He dy'd in the Year 998. He is
Armenia. said to be the Author of a little Treatise of the Religion of
the *Armenians*, containing an Abridgment of their Errors,

which is to be seen in *Latin* in the *Biblioth. Patr.* together
with a Fragment against irregular and rash Excommunica-
tions, where he says that they recoyl back on those Persons
who dart them out too rashly.

Nicephorus the Philosopher.

Nicephorus the Philosopher
WE may likewise reckon among the Authors of this
Century, *Nicephorus* the Philosopher, who made Fu-

neral Orations on the Death of *Anthony* Patriarch of *Alex-*
andria.

Moses Bar-Cephas.

Moses Bar-Cephas.
LASTly, to these we may joyn *Moses Bar-Cephas*, Bi-
shop of *Syria*, who compos'd in *Syriack* a Treatise
concerning *Paradise*, divided into three Books, set
forth in *Latin* by *Mastus*, printed first at *Antwerp*,
in the Year, 1569. and afterwards in the *Biblioth. Patrum*.
'Tis a very large Commentary on what was said concern-
ing *Paradise* in the Book of *Genesis*. In the first Book he
treats of the *Earthly Paradise*: In the second, of the
mystical Paradise, that is to say, of the mystical Sig-

nifications of that which is call'd the *Earthly Paradise*;
and in the last he treats of the Errors of Hereticks concern-
ing *Paradise*, and the Objections that may be brought to
the contrary. In this last Book he maintains, That *Adam*
was created mortal, and that God would have render'd
him immortal by his Grace, if he had not sinn'd: however,
he refutes *Theodore* and *Nestorius*, who had maintain'd that
the Sin of *Adam* was not the Cause of the Death of Man-
kind.

C H A P. II.

An Account of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.
THOUGH Historians have differ'd in their Judgment,
concerning the Tenth Century in general; yet they
all agree in their Accounts of the wretched State
and Condition of the Church of *Rome*, and those
who have been most favourable in their Censures, could
not but own that it was in a strange Disorder. 'At that
Time (cries Cardinal *Baronius*) How deform'd, how
frightful was the Face of the Church of *Rome*! The Holy
See was faln under the Tyranny of two loose and dis-
orderly Women, who plac'd and displac'd Bishops as
their Humour led them; and, (what I tremble to think
and speak of) they plac'd their Gallants upon *St. Peter's*
Chair, who did not so much as deserve the very Name
of Popes. For who dare say, that these infamous Persons,
who intruded without any Form of Justice, were lawful
Popes? We do not find that they were chosen by the
Clergy; or that they consented in the least to their Elec-
tion. All the Canons of Councils were infring'd, the De-
crees of Popes trampled under Foot, the ancient Tradi-
tions despis'd, the Customs and Ceremonies usually ob-
serv'd in the Election of Popes neglected, and the Holy
See became a Prey to Avarice and Ambition.' In such
Terms as these does this Cardinal, who cannot be suppos'd
to be an Enemy to the Church of *Rome*, lament the sad
Estate wherein it was in this Tenth Century: And a long
Time before him, *Arnold* Bishop of *Orleans*, who probably
might have been an Eye-witness of some of these Disorders,
breaks out into this Complaint: 'O miserable *Rome*! Thou
that formerly didst hold out so many great and glorious
Luminaries to our Ancestors, into what prodigious Dark-
ness art thou now faln, which will render thee infamous
to all succeeding Ages?

The Ordination of Pope Formosus.
We may trace the Beginning of this Disorder from the
Promotion of *Formosus* to the Popedom, which sow'd the
Seed of the Divisions which afterwards ensued. This *For-*
mosus being Bishop of *Ostia*, had been depos'd by *John VIII*.
in a Synod held at *Rome*, and constrain'd to swear he would
continue a Layman all the rest of his Life. He was depos'd
for these three Reasons. 1. Because having been sent by Pope
Nicholas I. into *Bulgaria*, he made the King of the *Bulgar-*
ians swear that he would not admit of any other Bishop
besides himself, that should be sent thither by the Holy See.
2. Because he had already endeavoured to be translated from
the Church of *Ostia* to that of *Rome*, and made Parties for
the attaining of his End, contrary to the Laws prescrib'd
in the Canons. 3. Because he had abandon'd his Church
without the Pope's Leave, and that having left *Rome*, he
was suspected to have conspir'd against the Empire and the
Church. This Sentence of *John VIII.* was repeal'd by his
Successor *Marinus*, who re-call'd *Formosus*, re-establish'd
him in his Bishoprick, and declar'd the Oath he had been
forc'd to take to be null and void. However he still kept
up the Design he had laid of advancing himself to the Pope-
dom; and he so well form'd his Intrigue, that after the
Death of *Stephen V.* he had so powerful a Party as to carry
it, against *Sergius* a Deacon of the Church of *Rome*, who
had been elected by a great Part of the Clergy. *Formosus* hin-
der'd his Ordination, drove him out of the Church, and
forc'd him to fly to *Tuscany* to the Marquis *Adalbert*, who

declar'd himself his Protector. *Formosus* was ordain'd on
the 27th. of May, in the Year 891. The Year after he crown'd
Guy Duke of *Spoleto* Emperor, and a while after conferr'd
the same Title on *Lambert* the Son of that Prince. But no
sooner was *Arnulphus* King of *Germany* faln down into
Italy, but *Formosus* invited him to *Rome*, designing to make
him an Instrument of wreaking his Revenge on those Ko-
mans who had affronted him. *Arnulphus* enter'd the City
by Force, caus'd the chief of the Enemies of *Formosus* to
be beheaded, and was for this Piece of Service crown'd
Emperor by this Pope in the Year 896. No sooner was
Arnulphus gone off, but the *Romans* renew'd their Conspi-
racies against *Formosus*, who dy'd about the latter End of
this Year.

Boniface, whom the People put up in his Stead, was a very
unworthy Man, who had been degraded from his Subdea-
conship, and the Order of Priesthood. A few Days after
he was outed by *Adalbert*, and *Stephen VI.* advanc'd to the
Chair. This Man immediately declares himself an Enemy
to the Memory of *Formosus*; calls a Council, wherein he nulls
all the Ordinations made by *Formosus*; dug up his Corps,
and having dress'd him up in his Pontifical Robes, he con-
demn'd him as if he had been alive: And after he had cen-
sured him for his Ambition in quitting the Bishoprick of *Ostia*,
and usurping *St. Peter's* Chair, contrary to the Canons of
the Church, he caus'd him to be stripp'd of his Robes, cut
off his three Fingers, wherewith he gave the Blessing, and
threw him into the *Tiber*. A base and barbarous Proceed-
ing this! and such as has struck Horror into all those who
have wrote about it. For tho' the Promotion of *Formosus*
was not agreeable to the Canons, and might prove a very
ill Precedent; yet such a disingenuous Cruelty exercised to
no Purpose upon a dead Carcass, was a certain Demonstra-
tion of the Spite and Malice, or rather of the Madness where-
with his Enemies were possess'd. And in truth all this
Tragedy was begun by *Sergius*, and supported by the Au-
thority of *Adalbert*, who bore at that Time the greatest Sway
in *Rome*. But his Interest afterwards growing weaker, *Ste-*
phen was severely used by the *Romans*, and cast into Prison,
where he was strangled about the latter End of the Year 900.
if his Epitaph is to be credited in the Case.

The *Romans* advanc'd one *Romanus* in his Place, who
sat but a few months on the Chair: however he had so much
Time as to condemn and disannul all that his Predecessor
had done against *Formosus*. The Man who succeeded him,
nam'd *Theodorus*, was of his Mind, but he died within
twenty Days.

After his Death the *Romans* chose a Monk, Deacon of the
Town of *Tivoli*, Son of *Rampealdus*, who went under the
Name of *John IX.* This Man seeing *Italy* divided by the
Factions of those who made their Pretensions to the Em-
pire, behaved himself very cautiously in the Beginning of
his Popedom. The Emperor *Arnulphus* dy'd about the End
of the Year 899. and *Guy* of *Spoleto* died within a short Time
after, so that *Italy* was disputed between *Berenger*, *Lewis*
the Son of *Boson*, and *Lambert* the Son of *Guy*. The Prin-
ces of *Italy*, weary of the Government of *Berenger*, espe-
cially *Adalbert*, Marquis of *Torea*, the Father of another
Berenger, who was afterwards King of *Italy*, had called in
Lewis;

Lewis; but *Berenger* assisted by *Adalbert*, Marquis of *Tuscany*, having hemm'd him in, obliged him to return, and made him renounce his Pretensions to the Kingdom. A while after *Adalbert*, who had supported the Interests of *Berenger*, recalled *Lewis*, who retook Part of *Italy*; but those who had invited him in, soon betray'd him, and delivered him into *Berenger's* Hands, who caus'd his Eyes to be put out. *Berenger* twoln with his Success comes to *Rome*, and forces Pope *John IX.* to crown him Emperor: But no sooner was he gone from *Rome*, but the Pope sent for *Lambert*, who resided privately in a corner of *Italy*, and declar'd him Emperor.

Since by this Action he found himself oblig'd to acknowledge *Formosus* for lawful Pope, because it was he who had crown'd *Lambert*, he held a Council, wherein he cancell'd all the Proceedings against that Pope. After so bold an undertaking, he durst not stay at *Rome*, where the Interest of *Berenger* was most powerful, but retir'd to *Ravenna*, where in another Council of 74 Bishops, he confirm'd what had been done at *Rome*. The *Italians*, who love to have a great many Masters, and to change the Government, acknowledg'd *Lambert*, and his Forces became so considerable, that *Berenger* durst not attack him, but retir'd to *Verona*. All this happen'd in the Year 904.

The Year after *John IX.* dy'd, and *Benedict IV.* succeeded him, who was not upon the Chair above a Year or thereabouts, and did nothing of any note. He who was set up in his Room, call'd *Leo V.* was outed forty Days after by one of his Domesticks, nam'd *Christophilus*. He did not enjoy this Dignity long; for that *Sergius*, whom we formerly mentioned, and who had been the Competitor of *Formosus*, being come to *Rome*, seiz'd on *Christophilus*, put him in Prison, and stepp'd himself into *St. Peter's* Chair. The first Thing he did was to condemn *Formosus*, to declare his Ordinations null, and to cancel all that *John IX.* had done in his Favour. Afterwards he degraded those whom *Formosus* had ordain'd, and either ordain'd them over again, or ordained others in their Stead. This Man is esteem'd a Monster, not only for his Ambition and the violent Proceedings he was guilty of, but also upon the Account of his loose Morals. He had a Bastard by *Marosia* the Daughter of *Theodora*, who being a long Time before highly in the Favour of *Adalbert*, bore a great Sway in *Rome*. This Bastard Son of his was afterwards promoted to the Popedom by the Intrigues of this *Marosia*, and took upon him the Name of *John XI.* as we shall shew in the Sequel. *Sergius* enjoy'd the See which he had usurp'd, only three Years; he died in the Year 910. After him *Anastasius* came, of whom History is silent. About this Time *Lambert* was traiterously murder'd, as he was hunting, by a Count of *Milan*. After his Death *Adalbert*, whom he had taken Prisoner some Time before, was set at Liberty, and *Berenger* was the only Man who pretended to the Title of King of *Italy* and Emperor. The Popedom of *Anastasius* did not last above two Years and some few Months; after whose Death *Landon* was promoted to the Chair, no doubt by the Interest of *Theodora*. For that wicked Woman made use of him to prefer one of her Favorites, nam'd *John*, to the Archbishoprick of *Ravenna*. Let us see in what Terms *Luitprand* relates this Matter: 'About this Time, says he, *Peter* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, which was esteem'd the chiefest Archbishoprick next to that of *Rome*, sent frequently to *Rome* a Deacon of his Church, call'd *John*, to pay his due Respects to the Pope. *Theodora*, that impudent Whore, having seen him, fell desperately in love with him, prevail'd upon him to maintain a shameful Familiarity with her. While they liv'd thus lustfully together, the Bishop of *Bologna* dying, this *John* was chose in his Place. But before he was consecrated, the Archbishop of *Ravenna* dies also; and *Theodora* prevails upon *John* to quit the Bishoprick of *Bologna*, and to accept of this Archbishoprick. He thereupon returns back to *Rome*, and was ordain'd Archbishop of *Ravenna*. Within a while after, the Pope (namely *Landon*) who had ordain'd him dies, God calling him to give an Account of his unjust Proceedings in ordaining *John*. *Theodora* upon this, that she might not be far from her Lover, made him again to relinquish the Archbishoprick of *Ravenna*, and to seize upon *St. Peter's* Chair.

Tho' *John* was so shamefully promoted to the Popedom, yet he enjoy'd it a long Time very peaceably; and was acknowledged as lawful Pope by all the Churches. But as God never suffers the Crimes of Men to go unpunish'd, unless for a Season, thereby to make his Justice the more conspicuous, so the Conclusion of his Popedom was tragical, and he fell by the same Steps, by which he had been advanc'd. This *Theodora* we speak of, had two Daughters, more wicked and more debauch'd than her self, call'd *Marosia* and *Theodora*. The first of these after she had prostituted her self to Pope *Sergius*, was marry'd to *Guy*, the Son of *Adalbert* Marquis of *Tuscany*, who, aspiring to be as absolute in *Rome*, as his Father had been before him, took it ill that Pope *John* should prefer his Brother *Peter*, and thought he gave him too great an Authority. He thereupon resolv'd to divest him of it, and taking the Opportunity when

VOL. II.

the Pope was with his Brother in the *Lateran* Palace, with a very few Attendants, he order'd an Assault to be made by the Soldiers he had rais'd, who put the Pope into Prison, having first kill'd his Brother before his Face. He there dy'd some Time after, either for Grief, or rather by an untimely Death. This happen'd in the Year 928.

Leo VI. who succeeded him, had a Design, if Historians may be credited, of restoring *Italy* and the City of *Rome* to its former Quiet; but he had not Time for it, being upon the Chair no longer than six Months and fifteen Days. 'Tis said he likewise dy'd in Prison, as his Predecessor did before him. *Stephen VII.* who succeeded him, enjoy'd the Place but two Years, one Month, and a few Days.

Marosia, upon this Vacancy of the Holy See, thought there could be no better Way of making her self absolute in *Rome*, and raising her Family, than by placing the Son she had by Pope *Sergius*, upon the Chair. Tho' by Reason of his Birth, his Age, and his Conduct, he was very unworthy of that Promotion. He took upon him the Name of *John XI.* and was ordain'd in the Year 931. Some Time after *Guy* dy'd, and his Brother *Lambert* was declared his Successor. But *Marosia* invited *Hugh*, Son of Count *Thibold*, Duke of *Provence*, and King of *Arles*, and promis'd to make him Master of *Rome*, in case he would marry her. He not willing to let such an Opportunity slip, came forthwith to wait upon her at the Castle of *Angelo*, and marry'd her, tho' she was his Brother's Widow. For this *Hugh* was the Son of *Bertha*, who had been marry'd first to *Thibold*, and then to *Adalbert*, the Father of *Guy*. The *Romans* receiv'd him very kindly: But afterwards finding that he slighted them, they sought nothing so much as an Opportunity of ridding themselves of his Government. Soon after an Opportunity presented it self: For *Alberic*, who was likewise the Son of *Marosia*, being disgusted with his Father-in-law, for affronting him whilst by his Mother's Order he fill'd him out a Glass of Wine, excited the *Romans* to throw off the Yoke of King *Hugh*, representing to them how deep a Disgrace it was for *Romans* to be subject to the *Burgundians*. They thereupon quickly abandon'd his Interest; and having chosen *Alberic* their Leader, they set upon the Castle of *St. Angelo*, with so much Expedition, that *Hugh* having not Time to throw any of his Troops into the Place, was forc'd to provide for his own Safety; *Marosia* was seiz'd upon by *Alberic's* Order, who likewise secur'd his Brother Pope *John*, and kept him close Prisoner during the Remainder of his Popedom, which expir'd in the Year 935. The City was govern'd a long Time by *Alberic*, who changed the Form of the Government, made himself Consul, and commanded in chief with a Prefect and Tribunes.

Whilst these things were in Action, *Italy* was disputed between several Princes, who all pretended to the Sovereignty thereof. The *Italians* being weary of the Government of *Berenger*, in the Year 924. conferr'd the Sovereignty on *Radulphus* King of *Burgundy*, Grandson to *Conrad* and *Adelaid*, the Daughter of *Lewis the Godly*. *Berenger* seeing himself turn'd out of Possession, brought the *Huns* into *Italy*, who haras'd all *Lombardy*; but having pass'd the Mountains, they were defeated by *Radulphus* in *Langnedoc*. At the same Time *Berenger* using his Endeavours to re-estate himself in the Kingdom of *Italy*, was slain by his own Men at *Verona*. After his Death, the Title of Emperor of the West was not conferr'd on any one, at least not by the Pope and *Italians*, till *Otho I.* in the Year 962. By *Berenger's* Death *Radulphus* became sole Sovereign of *Italy*, but the Inconstancy of the *Italians*, which always put them upon driving out one Sovereign by another, caus'd them to submit to *Hugh* Count *Arles*, Son to Count *Thibold* and *Bertha*, the Daughter of *Lotharius II.* *Radulphus*, after he had received Intelligence that they had traiterously kill'd his Father-in-law, *Burchard* Duke of *Suabia*, retired to his own Kingdom of *Burgundy*, and left *Hugh* in quiet Possession of *Italy*. We have already shewn after what Manner he became Master of *Rome*, by the Means of *Marosia*, and also how he was outed by *Alberic*. He reveng'd himself on *Lambert* the Brother of *Guy*, the Affront he receiv'd from his Sister-in-law, and having apprehended him, he caus'd his Eyes to be put out, and bestow'd the Dukedom of *Tuscany* on his Brother, who proved no more faithful to him than *Lambert*. The *Italians* presently recall'd King *Radulphus*, who put himself into a Posture of re-entering *Italy*, and of engaging in a fresh War with King *Hugh*; but these two Kings thought it most proper to come to an Accommodation, on Condition that *Radulphus* should renounce his Pretensions to the Kingdom of *Italy*, and *Hugh* should yield to him all the Country he had then in Possession beyond the *Alps*. Notwithstanding this Accommodation, the *Italians* continuing still resolv'd to abandon *Hugh*, invited *Arnulphus* Duke of *Bavaria*, the bastard Son of *Arnulphus* the Emperor, to come and take Possession of the Crown. This Prince enters into *Italy* with an Army, and advances as far as *Verona*, where he was received by Count *Milo* and *Ratherius* Bishop of the Place. *Hugh* came immediately with an Army and sat down before the Place, and having defeated a considerable Party of the Troops of *Arnulphus*, he oblig'd

R r

him

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

Leo VI. Stephen VII.

John XI. A Monster of a Pope.

Alberic becomes Master of Rome.

The Wars of Italy.

him to think of making his Retreat, and of taking Count Milo along with him. The Count no sooner understood his Design, but he went over to King Hugh, and Arnulphus perceiving he was abandon'd by him, withdrew in great haste to Bavaria. The City of Verona immediately surrender'd to King Hugh, who sent Ratharicus Bishop of that City, a Prisoner to Pavia. Hugh, puffed up with this Success, after he had caus'd his Son Lotharius to be proclaim'd King, endeavour'd to surprize the City of Rome, and besieg'd it; but perceiving he could not have his Aim, he treated with Alberic, and gave him in Marriage his Daughter Elda, in hopes, that afterwards he might make himself Master of Rome; but Alberic, as subtle a Politician as himself, would not relinquish the Place, nor put it into the Hands of his Father-in-law.

Manasses. Much about this Time Manasses, Archbishop of Arles, King Hugh's Kinsman, thinking he might make his Fortune greater under the Government of his Kinsman, quitted his Church at Arles, and comes into Italy, and obtain'd, contrary to all Form of Law, the Bishopricks of Verona, Trent, and Mantua, to which he annex'd the Marquisate of Trent.

Leo VII. Whilst Alberic govern'd Rome, the Holy See was fill'd by Popes of a blameless Life; but they found themselves in a Capacity of wishing, rather than of doing Good. Leo VII. who succeeded John XI. in the Year 936. was call'd by Flodoard, the Servant of God. His good Intention was apparent by his sending for Odo the Abbot of Cluny, to manage the Treaty between Hugh and Alberic. He likewise wrote two Letters, of which we will speak hereafter, which shew him to be a lover of Ecclesiastical Discipline. The Pontificate of this Pope lasted no longer than three Years and a few Months. The Romans chose in his Place, in the Year 939. a German, who went under the Name of Stephen VIII. This Election was very highly resented by Alberic, who thought that a Roman would have been more for his Interest: Therefore suspecting that he favour'd Hugh, and held a private Correspondence with Otho, he caus'd him to be ill treated. They mangled his Face so barbarously, and render'd it so deform'd, that he durst not appear any more in Publick. This Pope sent a Legate into France called Damasus, to the Princes of France and Burgundy, exhorting them to acknowledge Lewis, the Son of Charles the Simple, for their lawful King, and threatening to excommunicate them, if they did not do it. He likewise sent for Odo again into Italy, to mediate the Peace between Hugh and Alberic, but all to no Purpose, for both Odo and the Pope dy'd before it was concluded.

Marinus II. Marinus II. succeeded Pope Stephen in the year 943. who was reputed to be a Man of singular Piety; and we have an Account in the Life of St. Ulric, Bishop of Aurbourg, that he foretold to this Saint the Death of his Predecessor Adalberon, and withal assur'd him that he should succeed him; which happen'd thirty years before he was Pope. All the Time of his Popedom he was very serviceable to the Church of Rome, in reforming the Clergy and the Monks, in repairing Churches, and in taking a particular Care of the Poor. He did likewise what he could to promote Peace among the Christian Princes. He concluded that between Alberic and Hugh, and wrote several Letters in order to make up the Breach between Otho King of Germany, who endeavour'd to enter Italy, and Lotharius, the Son of Hugh, who oppos'd his Design. He call'd to Rome the Prior of Mount Cassin, and bestow'd on him the Government of the Monastery of St. Paul in Rome. 'Tis likewise said that he wrote a Letter to Sico Bishop of Capua, wherein he charges him with his Ignorance of the Canons; with his want of Learning; with his holding too great an Intimacy with secular Persons; and with his having endeavour'd, contrary to all Form, to confer a Benefice on one of his Deacons, which belong'd to a Monastery. He granted several Privileges to the Benedictin Monks, whom he favour'd in a great many Instances.

Agapetus II. Agapetus II. who succeeded Marinus, was likewise a holy Man, who govern'd the Church of Rome with a great deal of Prudence. He sent into France a Bishop, whose Name was Marinus, to assist in the quality of a Legate in that Council held at Ingelheim, in the year 948. about the Contests between King Lewis and Prince Hugh; and Hugh of Vermandois and Artaldus, Pretenders to the Archbishoprick of Rheims. The Cause was there determin'd in Favour of Artaldus, who was confirm'd in that Bishoprick. Hugh of Vermandois was declar'd an Intruder and excommunicated; and a Letter was written to Prince Hugh the White, in the Name of the whole Council, and to his Adherents, to admonish them to return to their Allegiance, under the Pain of Excommunication. The Sentence of this Council was confirm'd the year following in a Council held by Agapetus, wherein Prince Hugh was excommunicated, till such Time as he should give Satisfaction to King Lewis.

The Wars between Hugh and Berenger. Under this Pope's Pontificate Italy felt another Revolution. Adalbert, Marquis of Ivrea, had two Sons, Berenger by Gilla, the Daughter of Berenger King of Italy; and Anschaire by Ermegarda, Daughter of the Marquis of Tuscany.

These two Princes inherited the Power of their Father and Grand-fathers by the Mother's Side, and govern'd a Part of Italy. The first was prudent, ingenious and politic; the second was valiant and bold. King Hugh had marry'd his Niece Villa, the Daughter of Boson to Berenger, but he began to be jealous of the growing Greatness of those two Brothers, and resolv'd to put a Stop to it. He began with Anschaire, whom he caus'd to be set upon by Sarlio, who having made the Spoletians and Camerines to revolt, defeated the Troops he had rais'd for his own Defence, and kill'd him in the Skirmish. Berenger, desirous to revenge the Death of his Brother, conspir'd against King Hugh. This Prince having Intelligence thereof, took up a Resolution in his Council to send for him, under Pretence of making up a Reconciliation, and then to put him to Death; but his young Son Lotharius, who had been present in Council, could not forbear advertising Berenger thereof, who, upon the Receipt of this Intelligence, fled forthwith to Hermian Duke of Suabia, who presented him to King Otho. Hugh sent to demand him, but Otho was so far from delivering him up, that he took him under his Protection. A while after Berenger returns to Italy, at the Head of some Troops; and having laid Siege to a Fort which was held out by Adelard, the Clerk of Manasses, he became Master of it, by promising the Archbishoprick of Milan to that Bishop, and to the Clerk the Bishoprick of Cune, in Case he should become Master of Italy. Big with these Hopes, Manasses, importunes the Princes of Italy in his Behalf. Milo Count of Verona, was the first who declar'd for Berenger, and receiv'd him into his City. The Bishop of Modena soon follow'd his Example, as did likewise the City of Milan, where the Princes of Italy came to wait on Berenger, having deserted King Hugh, who was retir'd to Pavia. From this Place he sent his Son Lotharius to Milan, conjuring Berenger and the Princes of Italy, to acknowledge him for their King; and that for his own Part he had taken a Resolution to retire into Provence. The People mov'd with Compassion towards Lotharius, who was not then above fourteen or fifteen years old, acknowledged him their King; with the Consent of Berenger; and they wrote to Hugh, acquainting him, that he might (if he pleas'd) reside still in Italy. This Berenger order'd, with a Design of seizing upon his Treasures, which he was carrying off to Provence: For Hugh and Lotharius were only titular Kings, while the whole Power of governing was lodg'd in the Hands of Berenger. Hugh could not bear this, but cunningly retir'd into Provence, where he dy'd a short Time after; leaving his Estate to his Niece Bertha, the Widow of Boson, Count of Arles. This Revolution happen'd about the Year 945. Lotharius still retained the Name of King of Italy, but did not long enjoy it; for about four years after, whether out of Grief to see himself slighted, or whether by the Means of some Poison, he fell mad, and dy'd childless, about the latter End of the year 949. Berenger presently caus'd himself to be proclaim'd King, and to be crown'd with his eldest Son Adalbert; and that he might render his new Authority the stronger, he sought in Marriage for his Son, Adalaid, the Widow of Lotharius, Daughter to Radulphus II. and Sister to Conrad, Kings of Burgundy. This Princess having refus'd the Offer, he besieg'd her in Pavia, took her, and sent her Prisoner to a Castle call'd le Garde: however, she escap'd thence by the Help of a Priest, and fled to Azho her Kinsman, who undertook to defend her in the Fort of Canossa, where she secur'd her self. Berenger immediately sat down before the Place with all his Forces. But in the second year of the Siege, this Queen seeing her self reduc'd to the last Extremity, sent to beg King Otho's Assistance, and with her self offered him the Kingdom of Italy. The love of Glory rather than Interest inclin'd this Prince to cross the Mountains. He delivers Adalaid, marries her, and takes her along with him into Germany, leaving his Army with Conrad, Duke of Lorrain, to make an End of the War. Conrad press'd so hotly on Berenger and his Son, that they were forc'd to lay down their Arms, and submit to Otho, whom they went to wait upon in Germany. He having given them an Oath of Allegiance and Fealty, restor'd their Kingdom to them, only excepting the Veronese and Friul, which he gave to his Brother the Duke of Bavaria.

During all these Revolutions in Italy, Rome was very quiet under the Government of Alberic, who would not suffer Otho to enter the Place, though the Pope Agapetus had invited him thither. The Death of Alberic, which happen'd in the year 954. made no Alteration in Rome, for his Son Octavian, not above 16 years old, having taken his Place, continued the same Form of Government: And not satisfied with the Temporal Power, he was minded to annex to it the Spiritual Authority, by getting himself advanced to St. Peter's Chair, after the Death of Agapetus, which happen'd in the year 955. He was not at that Time above 18 years of Age at most, and was the first Pope that changed his Name, by assuming that of John. He was truly the Twelfth of that Name, tho' several count him the Thirteenth,

Pope John XII.

Thirteenth, being led into that mistake by the fabulous story of *Pope Joan*. This Man was so far from having any of those qualities requisite for so great a Dignity, that he was a Monster in Debauchery and Irregularity. He began with making War against *Pendula* Prince of *Capua*, in order to turn him out of his Estates: But his design did not succeed, and he was forc'd to retire, and to sue for Peace. The Power of *Berenger* and *Adalbert* became so great, that they began to be a Terror both to the Pope and the Romans. Ever since *Otho* had re-establish'd them in the Kingdom of *Italy*, they had continued to conspire against him and cruelly to oppress their Subjects. *Otho*, willing to bring them to Subjection, had sent his Son *Luitolf* into *Italy* to give them Correction. This young Prince had almost chas'd them out of their Dominions, when he dy'd in the Year 958, not without suspicion of being poison'd, and so left his Conquest imperfect. After his Death, *Berenger* and *Adalbert* were re-established in their Kingdom, and continued to exercise their Tyranny not only to the other *Italians*, but also to the *Romans*. This was the reason why *John XII.* sent two Legates to *Otho*, praying him ardently for the Love of God, and the Apostles *St. Peter* and *St. Paul*, (they are *Luitprand's* words) to come and deliver the Church of *Rome* from the incroachments of these Tyrants, and to restore it to its primitive health and liberty. *Walbert* Archbishop of *Milan*, turn'd out of his Church by that *Manasse*, we formerly mention'd, and *Waldon*, Bishop of *Cuma*, turn'd likewise out of his Bishoprick, and several other Lords divested of their Demeasns, went at the same time to prefer their complaints to *Otho*; who being affected with the miseries of *Italy*, march'd thither, after he had crown'd his Son *Otho* at *Aix la Chapelle*, though a lad of but about seven Years of Age. Upon his Arrival, *Berenger*, his Wife, and his Son, being abandon'd by his Subjects, withdrew from the Towns and the open Country, and betook themselves each of them to a Cittadel. *Otho* was every where receiv'd with great Acclamations, recovers *Pavia*, was crown'd King of *Lombardy* at *Milan* by the Archbishop, and from thence he march'd to *Rome*, where he receiv'd the Imperial Crown in the beginning of the Year 962. at the hands of *John XII.* with the Universal Acclamations of both Clergy and Laity. He spent some time there with the Pope, and having restor'd to the Church of *Rome* that which of right belong'd to it, according to his promise, he made *Pope John* and the principal men of the City, to swear by the Body of *St. Peter*, that they would bear true Allegiance to him, and never furnish *Berenger* or *Adalbert* with any Supplies. After this he return'd to *Pavia*, with a full design of putting an end to the War, by taking those Castles which still held out for *Berenger*. He began with taking the Isle of *St. Jula*, whither *Berenger's* Wife was retir'd, and restor'd it to the Church of *Novar*. In the mean time, *Adalbert*, seeking for assistance in every place, retir'd at last to the *Sarazens*, and under-hand solicited *Pope John* to come over to his Party. This Pope, whose inclinations and intentions did not suit with those of the Emperor *Otho*, being as much a Slave to Vice and Debauchery, as that Prince was a Lover of Goodness and Virtue: This Pope, I say, that he might have the liberty of indulging his Lusts, made privately a League with *Adalbert*, and invited him to *Rome*, promising upon Oath to aid him against *Otho*. The Emperor being informed of it, sent several of his Attendants to *Rome*, to know what were the reasons which induc'd the Pope to enter into an Alliance with *Adalbert*. And when the *Romans* could give no other account, than that it arose only from the contrariety of *Pope John's* Morals and Conduct, to those of the Emperor; that Prince return'd this prudent Reply: "The Pope is as yet but a Child, he may be better'd by the Examples of good men; I hope to reclaim him from his extravagancies by a good honest reproof, and by wholesome Advice, and then we will say with the Prophet, *Behold the Change made by the Hand of the most High*. So without troubling his head much with the secret practices of the Pope, he laid Siege to the Castle of *Leo* in *Umbria*, whither *Berenger* and his Wife was retir'd. Thither the Pope sent *Leo*, chief Secretary of the Church of *Rome*, and *Demetrius*, one of the principal *Roman* Lords, to excuse his falling into the follies incident to youth, promising, that for the future he would be another kind of man: He gave them likewise orders to complain of the Emperor's entertaining *Bishop Leo*, and Cardinal *John* a Deacon, who had failed in their Duty towards him; and of his not keeping the promise he had made him, because he caus'd those whom he took to take the Oath to himself, but not to the Pope. The Emperor return'd this Answer, "That he was glad of the promise which the Pope had made of reforming, and becoming a better man for the future: That for his part he had religiously observ'd his promise; that he had indeed promis'd to restore to the Church of *Rome*, all the Territories which of right did belong to it; but before he could do that, he must first take them, and render himself Master of them: That he had neither seen the Bishop nor the Cardinal, whom they charg'd him

with entertaining; but that he had heard that being sent from the Pope to the Emperor of *Constantinople*, on a Negotiation against him, they had been taken at *Capua*, together with others whom the Pope sent to the *Huns*, to engage them to fall upon him: That these proceedings were prov'd by Letters sign'd by the Pope, and seal'd with the Papal Seal. *Otho* dismiss'd the Pope's Deputies with this Answer, and with them sent two Bishops to *Rome*, to make an ample justification for him; with orders, in case the Pope would not believe what they told him, to offer to prove it by the Combat of two Champions. *John XII.* received these Envoys very coldly, and to amuse the Emperor, he sent to him eight days after *John* the Bishop of *Narni*, and Cardinal *Benedict* a Deacon, to Negotiate with him. Before they return'd, *Adalbert* came to *Civita Vecchia*, and from thence to *Rome*, where he was receiv'd very kindly by the Pope. No sooner had the Emperor intelligence thereof, but he comes to *Rome* with his Forces in August 963, being invited by the *Romans* themselves, part of whom had seiz'd the Castle of *St. Paul*, and held it out against *Adalbert*. Upon his arrival, *John XII.* and *Adalbert* went off; the *Romans* received *Otho*, and took a new Oath of Allegiance to him, promising that they would neither chuse nor ordain any Pope without his consent and approbation. Three days after, upon the request of several Bishops of *Italy*, and the People of *Rome*, he held a grand Council in *St. Peter's* Church, where there met the Emperor, for the Archbishop of *Aquileia*, who was fallen sick in Town; *Radulphus* the Deacon, *Walbert* Archbishop of *Milan*, *Peter* of *Ravenna*, an Archbishop and Bishop of *Saxony*, *Orger* Bishop of *Spires*, and *Bublus* Bishop of *Parma*, with about 33 *Italian* Bishops more, fourteen or fifteen Cardinals, and a great many Officers of the Church of *Rome*, with several Lords and a Representative for the People. The Emperor demanded of the Assistants, why the Pope was not present in this Council; they reply'd, that they wonder'd he should ask them a thing which was so well known to the whole World: That *John* was not one of those, who being cover'd with Sheeps cloathing, are inwardly Ravenous Wolves; but that he committed publicly and in the Eye of the world diabolical Actions, without putting himself to the trouble of concealing them. The Emperor told them it was but reasonable to express in particular, the heads of his Accusation, and afterwards to debate what ought to be done. Then Cardinal *Peter* a Priest, said he had seen him celebrate the Mass without communicating: *John* Bishop of *Narni*, and a Cardinal Deacon of the same name, declared that they had seen him ordain a Deacon in a Stable extra tempore: *Benedict*, and the other Priests and Deacons of *Rome* declared, that they knew him to have conferr'd Orders for Money, and to have ordain'd a Child of ten years old Bishop of *Todi*. That it was not necessary to bring Witnesses to attest these Sacrileges, since they were so visible, that all that could be said about them, would not express the one half of what they would appear to be. As for the Adultery whereof he was accus'd, they said, that indeed, they were not Eye-witnesses of the Fact, but that they knew for certain, that he had abus'd the Widow of *Ranier*, *Stephania*, his Father's Concubine, the Widow *Ann* and her Niece, and that he had made his Court the very sink of Debauchery: That he went publicly a hunting: That he had put out the Eyes of *Benedict*, his spiritual Father, whereof he dy'd: That he had cut off the Privy-Members of Cardinal *John* the Subdeacon, whereof he likewise dy'd: That he had been the cause of a great many Fires; and that he was seen with a Sword in his hand, an Helmet on his head, and a Coat of Mail on his body. The Clergy and Laity there present cry'd out that they had seen him drink a health to the Devil, and swear by the Heathen Gods in his play at Hazards: That he never took care to say his Office, or to make the Sign of the Cross. Upon these accusations, the Emperor ordered *Luitprand* Bishop of *Cremona* to tell the Synod in *Latin* (for they could not understand the *Saxon* Language, in which he spoke) that he conjur'd them in the name of God, the Blessed Virgin, and the Apostles to advance nothing against the Pope, but what was certain and would bear good proof: They all replied, that they were willing to be anathematiz'd, if *Pope John* were not guilty of the Crimes laid to his Charge, nay and of far more shameful and horrid than had been mentioned. That if he would not believe them in this, yet that could not be call'd in question of which the Emperor's whole Army were Spectators, viz. That he appeared in Armour from Top to Toe at the Head of his Forces; and that if the *Tiber* had not been between him and the Emperor's Army, he would have been taken Prisoner in that Equipage. The Emperor acknowledg'd that this was true, and all his Souldiers were Witnesses to it. The Synod were of Opinion that it was necessary to write to the Pope, that he might come and clear himself of the Crimes laid to his Charge. The Letter was written in the name of the Emperor, of the Bishops of *Liguria*, *Tuscany*, *Saxony*, and *France*, who resided then at *Rome*. They acquainted *John*, to whom they gave the Title of

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

Pontifex Summus, and that of *Universal Bishop*, that having demanded of the Clergy and Laity of *Rome* the reason of his absence, they had related such abominable things of him, as would make the most impudent to blush: That he was accused of Homicide, of Perjury, of Sacrilege, and of Incest with two of his Relations: That it was likewise reported of him, that he had drunk a Health to the Devil, and sworn by *Jupiter*, *Venus*, and the other Heathen Deities in his play at Hazards: That they earnestly intreat him to come and clear himself of these Accusations, assuring him upon Oath that nothing should be done against him but what was agreeable to the Canons. This Letter bears date *November 6. 963.* Pope *John XII.* having received it, return'd this answer. "We hear you design to

Nos Audimus dicere, quod vos vultis alium Papam facere. Si hoc facitis, excommunicamus vos de Deo Omnipotente ut non habeatis licentiam ullam ordinare, & Missam celebrare.

"make another Pope; but if you do, I excommunicate you by the Almighty God, so that you shall not be capable of ordaining any man, or of celebrating the Mass. This Letter being remitted to the Synod, to which the Archbishop of *Treves*, and three Bishops of *Emilia* and *Liguria* were likewise come; they made the Pope this Reply: That the Letter he had sent was a sign of his folly and want of Prudence: That he should have alledg'd some reasonable excuse of his absence, and sent his Deputies to give the Synod an account thereof: That they would submit to him, provided he delay'd not coming to clear himself of the Crimes laid to his charge; but that if he would not do that, they would not Value his Excommunication, which they might with Justice retort upon him. The second Letter of the Council to the Pope bears date *November 20.* and was sent by Cardinal *Adrian* a Priest, and Cardinal *Benedict* a Deacon: They went as far as *Tiber* to give it him, but they could not meet with him there, for he rode into the Country before they came. Wherefore not meeting with any Person that could inform them where he was gone, they brought the Letter back to the Council, which was sitting a third time. The Emperor presented to them the Complaint which he in particular had to prefer against *John*, viz. That foras much as that Pope had sent for him to assist him against *Adalbert*, and had afterwards taken an Oath of Allegiance to him, yet he had since invited this same *Adalbert* to *Rome*, and put himself at the head of the Revolters. Then the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of *Rome* said, that it was necessary to cure this extraordinary Wound, by as extraordinary a Remedy: That if the debauch'd Morals of Pope *John XII.* had injur'd the Emperor only, he might have met with some toleration; but since he was the ruine of so many, by the scandal and bad example he had given, they requir'd the Emperor that this Monster (whom it was impossible to reclaim from his Vices) should be turn'd out of the Church of *Rome*, and that another Pope of an exemplary Life should be set up in his room. The Emperor approv'd of this Resolution, and declar'd it was his desire, that they would choose one who was worthy of sitting in *St. Peter's* Chair. He had no sooner done speaking, but those who were present cry'd out unanimously, that they chose the Venerable *Leo*, chief Secretary of the Church of *Rome*, to be their Pastor, and Sovereign, and Universal Pope of the *Roman* Church, rejecting *John* the Apostate because of his irregular Life. Having repeated this their Vote three times, they, according to custom, conducted *Leo* to the *Lateral* Palace, consecrated him afterwards in *St. Peter's* Church, and took an Oath of Fidelity to him. After this the Emperor *Otho*, supposing he had nothing more to fear in *Rome*, dismiss'd part of his Troops, that they might not be a grievance to the People: But the *Romans*, won over by the promises of *John*, soon after rose up in Arms, and made Barricades to inclose and cut off *Otho*. But he was rescu'd by the bravery of his Troops, defeated the Seditious, kill'd part of them, and oblig'd the People to give him Hostages. Pope *Leo* the eighth of that name, willing to ingratiate himself with the People, prevail'd so far with the Emperor by his intreaties, that he perswaded him to restore the Hostages before his departure. But no sooner was this Prince withdrawn to pursue *Adalbert*, who lurk'd about *Camerin* and *Spoleto*, but the Women whom Pope *John* had debauch'd, stirr'd up the People to revolt afresh. The Seditious had a design of putting *Leo* to death, and receiving *John*; but the former found means of flying to the Emperor: As for the latter, he no sooner enter'd *Rome*, but he us'd the Friends of *Leo* very barbarously, among others Cardinal *John* a Deacon, whose right hand he caus'd to be cut off; *Afo* chief Secretary, whose Tongue he cut out, and cut off two of his Fingers and his Nose; and *Otger* Bishop of *Spire*, whom he caus'd to be whipp'd cruelly, and would not let him go, but in hopes by his means to obtain the Emperor's pardon. *John* to authorize his Proceedings by an Act that should have some shew of Justice, held a Synod *February 26.* in the Year 964. where assisted sixteen Bishops of *Italy*, and some Cardinals. These Prelates, devoted to the will and pleasure of this Pope, condemn'd the Synod which had depos'd him, and elected *Leo* in his stead: They pronounc'd a Sentence of Deposition against *Leo*: Anathematiz'd all those who favour'd him: Declar'd his Ordinations null:

The Council at Rome against John XII.

The Ordination of Pope Leo VIII.

The Re-establishment of Pope John XII.

Conven'd those whom he had ordain'd to the Council; And after they had oblig'd them to declare in writing, that he who had ordain'd them, having no power to do it, had not conferr'd any Order upon them, they stripp'd them of their habits: They constrain'd *Benedict* Bishop of *Porto*, and *Gregory* Bishop of *Albania*, to confess they had done amiss in ordaining *Leo*, and they suspended them for a time: And because *Sico* Bishop of *Ostia*, who was one of those that had ordain'd him, did not appear before the Synod, they declar'd him depriv'd of his Priesthood, without any hopes of being restor'd: They declar'd all those who had contributed to the Ordination of *Leo*, or favour'd him, or acknowledg'd him afterwards, to be depos'd or excommunicated.

The Emperor *Otho* being inform'd of what pass'd at *Rome*, prepar'd for his return thither, to punish *John* according to his deserts; but God prevented his Vengeance, for that infamous wretch receiv'd a mortal Wound as he was sporting himself one night with a Lady out of Town, of which he dy'd within eight days after, on the fourteenth of *May*, without receiving the Sacraments. The *Romans* persisting in their revolt, were before hand with the Emperor by choosing Cardinal *Benedict* a Deacon, and placing him upon the Papal Chair, upon his promise of never quitting it. A while after the Emperor came with his Army, sat down before *Rome*; and without being terrified at the Excommunication thunder'd against him by *Benedict*, he constrain'd the *Romans*, pinch'd with Famine and want of necessities, to open the City Gates unto him on the 23^d. of *June*. As soon as he enter'd *Rome*, that he might do nothing irregular, he held a Synod, where he caus'd *Benedict* to be brought in his Pontifical Habit. He demanded of him by Cardinal *Benedict* the Archdeacon, by what Authority, and according to what Laws he had usurp'd that Dignity in the Life time of Pope *Leo*, whom he himself had elected, and why he had violated the Oath he had taken with the rest of the *Romans*, not to chuse any Pope without the Consent of the Emperor. *Benedict* acknowledg'd his fault, and begg'd the Emperor's Pardon, he divest'd himself of his Pontifical habits, and put them together with the Pastoral Rod, into *Leo's* hands. *Leo* divest'd him likewise of his Cope, and declar'd him depriv'd of all Sacerdotal and Priestly Dignity, leaving him only the Order of Deacon, in consideration of the Emperor *Otho*; but he prohibited him from staying at *Rome*, and banish'd him. This Council by a solemn Decree, related by *Gratian*, granted to the Emperor the right of choosing a Pope, and of investing Bishops and Archbishops, and forbad the choosing a Pope without his Consent, or ordaining a Bishop elect, till he should receive investiture from the Emperor. There is another Decree of Pope *Leo*, whereby he grants to the Emperor *Otho* all that *Pepin* and *Charlemagne* had given to the Church of *Rome*; but this is such a dubious Piece, as deserves no credit.

Otho having thus quieted the City of *Rome*, departed thence after the Festival of *St. Peter*, in order to return to *Lombardy*, taking along with him the Antipope *Benedict* as Prisoner, and carrying off with him a great many Bodies of the Saints. He lost in his March a great many of his Men by Sicknes, kept his *Christmas* at *Pavia*, and the next year return'd into *Saxony*, after he had given his Instructions for the Affairs of *Italy*. *Benedict* dy'd at *Hamburg* in *July*, 965. after he had edified the *Germans* by his Piety, and made it appear that he deserv'd to have been Bishop of *Rome*, if he had been rais'd to that Dignity according to the Canon. *Leo* dy'd likewise the same year. After his Death the *Romans* sent Deputies to the Emperor *Otho*, to know his pleasure concerning the Election of a Pope. Some Authors have writ, that *Benedict* not being dead when *Leo* dy'd, the Emperor *Otho* had a design of re-establishing him, if he had not dy'd in the very interim. Let the case be how it will, *John* Bishop of *Narni*, who was his Creature, was the man whom he design'd to advance, to that Dignity; and 'tis very probable that he told his Intention to the *Roman* Deputies. He was thereupon elected, and plac'd in the Holy See, and is the *Thirteenth* of that Name. But whereas he was supported by the Emperor, and wedded to his Interests, he treated very haughtily the principal Lords of *Rome*, who affect'd to retain the Liberty they enjoy'd under *Alberic*. This was the reason why they declar'd against this Pope, and resolv'd to turn him out of his Popedom. They caus'd him to be arrested by *Roger* the Prefect of *Rome*, being assisted by *Jeofry* Count of *Campagna*, whither *John* was sent Prisoner. This *Jeofry* being kill'd some time after, and *Roger* being dead, the *Romans* being afraid of the Emperor *Otho*, who was preparing to come into *Italy*, set the Pope at liberty, and permitted him to return to *Rome*. However this did not hinder the Emperor from coming by great marches to *Rome*: upon his arrival, he arrested the Consuls, the Prefect, and the *Decemviri* (a Body of ten men who were instead of a Senate, and the Grand Council of the City.) He punish'd them after an exemplary manner, for he sent the Consuls and the Prefect Prisoners to *Germany*; and after

after he had caus'd the last to be shamefully dragg'd and whipp'd through the Streets of Rome, he hang'd upon the Decemviri. 'Tis reported that he likewise ordered the Bodies of Jeofry and Roger to be dug up, and after they were dragg'd through the City, to be cast into the Common-shore. Having by these severe Proceedings struck an Awe into the minds of the Romans, after he had kept his Christmas in the Year 966 at Rome, he went to Ravenna with Pope John, where he held a Synod about Easter, in the Year 967. wherein several Regulations were made in the Ecclesiastical Discipline; and the Emperor restor'd to the Church of Rome the Towns and Territories, which had been granted it formerly by Pepin and Charlemagne. They likewise excommunicated Harold Archbishop of Salzburg, because he would officiate and wear the Pall, tho' he had lost his sight; and because, being charged with several crimes besides, the Popes had prohibited him from exercising any Episcopal function, and Frederick was put in his place, who was now confirm'd. They likewise rais'd the Bishoprick on which the Town of Magdeburgh depended, to an Archbishoprick, by the Consent and Approbation of Hatto Archbishop of Mayence, and Hildevard Bishop of Halberstat. From Ravenna the Emperor went into Tuscany, and sent for his Son Otho, in order to have him crown'd Emperor by the Pope, which Ceremony was perform'd at Rome in the Christmas Holy-days, in the Year 967. After this Expedition of Otho, Pope John enjoy'd the Popedom very quietly whilst he liv'd. He rais'd the Bishoprick of Capua to an Archbishoprick, in recompence of the kind usage he met with there during his Imprisonment. He sent a Legate into Polonia, to instruct the Polonians, who desir'd to be converted. He likewise sent a Legate to the Vandals, and wrote several Letters, wherein he recommended to the Bishops the observation of the Church Discipline. 'Tis observ'd that he with a certain Ceremony blest a new Bell belonging to the Church of Saint John of the Lateran, and that this is the first instance we have of such Benedictions, on which the Title of *Christning* was afterwards improperly impos'd. This Pope dy'd September 6. 972. Donus alias Dominus succeeded him; who dy'd at the end of three Months, without having done any thing of note. After him Benedict VI. had the Popedom: Some there are who pretend, that he was in possession of it before Donus dyed. Let the case be how it will, he surviv'd him, but came to a tragical end. For Otho dying May 7. 973. a Roman Lord of great Authority, nam'd Cincius, caus'd the Pope to be seiz'd on, and committed him Prisoner to the Castle of St. Angelo, where he was strangled some few days after.

Donus and Benedict VI.

Boniface the Ufurper outed by Benedict.

The Wars and Death of Otho II.

Otho III. crowned Emperor.

This bloody design was put in Execution by the insinuation of Franco, surnam'd Boniface, a Cardinal Deacon, whom Gerbert terms the most impious monster of Mankind, who rather deserved the name of Maleface, than that of Boniface. This man, tho' all o're besmear'd with the blood of Benedict, yet seizes upon the Papal Chair in the Year 974. But the Romans could not endure him long; and having found out a Bishop named Benedict, of the Family of the Alberics, they set him up in opposition to Boniface, who was forced in the Year 975. to fly to Constantinople, whither he carried the things which he Sacrilegiously rifled from the Vatican Church before he went off. This Benedict was put up in his stead, and enjoy'd the Popedom very peaceably till the tenth of July, in the Year 984. on which day he dy'd. During these Revolutions, the Emperor Otho II. was wholly taken up in Germany, against the Bohemians, and Lotharius King of France; and he was no sooner out of that Fatigue, but he was engag'd to begin a new War in Italy against the Greeks, who, with the assistance of the Sarazens, designed to re-take Apulia and Calabria. At first he had some advantage over the Enemy, but afterwards he was entirely defeated and taken Prisoner: However, he found a way to make his escape, and having rally'd some Troops, he assaulted and took the City of Benevent, because the People of that Country had betray'd him. From thence he return'd to Rome, where he dy'd of grief on December 6. 983. After his death there arose a debate about the choice of an Emperor; some would have Henry Duke of Bavaria, Nephew to Otho the Great, to be crown'd: The Italians were for an Italian Emperor, nam'd Crescentius, but the Germans whose interest was strongest at Rome, caus'd Otho III. the Son of the last Otho

to be crown'd Emperor, with the Consent of Pope Benedict, who did not survive Otho II. above six Months.

Peter Bishop of Pavia was put in his place, and took upon him the name of John XIV. He was Lord High-Chancellor to the Emperor Otho, and it was doubtless by the recommendation of this Prince, that he was advanc'd to this Dignity, but he did not enjoy it long; for Boniface return'd from Constantinople in the Year 985. and having rais'd some of his own faction, and won the People by distributing among them the Money he had rais'd, by the sale of those rich Ornaments he had carry'd from Rome, he render'd himself very powerful in Rome, seiz'd on Pope John, loaded him with Irons, shut him up in the Castle of Saint Angelo, where he starv'd him to death at the end of four Months; but he himself did not survive above four Months, and dy'd hated by all the World, even by those of his own faction, who, after his Death, us'd his body very contumeliously. Upon the Death of this Tyrant, the Clergy and Laity of Rome were left at liberty to elect a Pope. The choice fell on a Priest nam'd John, the fifteenth Pope of that name. The beginning of his Popedom was disturb'd by the fear he had that Crescentius, who having taken upon him the Title of Consul, seiz'd on the Castle of St. Angelo, would not use him so kindly as he did his Predecessor. Under this apprehension he withdrew into Tuscany, from whence he sent several Deputies to Otho, praying him to come to his assistance. It was this that inclin'd the Romans, who knew by experience what they were to fear from such kind of Visits as the Emperors made, to send an honourable Embassage to the Pope, earnestly to entreat him to return, by giving him all the assurance he could desire. He hearkened to them, and was receiv'd with all the signs imaginable of submission and respect. From that time forward he enjoy'd the Holy See very peaceably till about the latter end of his Popedom, at which time he was again so disturb'd by Crescentius, that he was forced to pray the Emperor Otho to come to his assistance. This Prince immediately march'd with an Army into Italy, and stopp'd some time at Ravenna. During his stay there, John XV. dyed in May 996. The Romans were oblig'd by an order from the Emperor to elect in his place Bruno his Cousin-german, who took upon him the name of Gregory V. but Crescentius soon after outed him, and set up in his stead John Bishop of Placentia. This Gregory's Action was not long unpunish'd, for Otho came immediately with his Army, and being soon Master of Rome, re-establish'd Gregory. John secur'd himself with Crescentius, in the Castle of Saint Angelo. The Emperor besieg'd it, Crescentius held it out very vigorously, and it would have been very difficult to have taken it, had not he been kill'd treacherously. The Antipope John was taken, his Eyes were scratch'd out, his Nose and his Ears were cut off, and in that posture was he led through the Streets of Rome, mounted on an Ass with his Head towards the Tail, and forc'd to say as he went along, *Whoever shall dare to dispossess a Pope, let him be serv'd like me.*

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

John XVI. Boniface returns to Rome.

John XV.

V. John the Anti-pope.

Gerbert nam'd Pope Silvester II.

'Tis said that Gregory, to prevent the trouble which might afterwards arise in the Election of an Emperor, order'd that for the future it should be made by a certain number of German Princes, which he appointed; which was done at the instant, and by the authority of the Emperor Otho, and to favour those of his own Nation, and doubtless with the approbation of the Romans. This Pope did not survive his Election above two years and eight or nine Months. Otho caus'd Gerbert to be elected in his place, who took upon him the name of Silvester II. He had been formerly Archbishop of Rheims, and was then Archbishop of Ravenna, having been oblig'd, as we shall hereafter declare, to quit his first Archbishoprick. He was a man of great Learning, and much in favour with Otho, which inclin'd him to prefer him, before all others, to that Dignity, supposing he could not find a person more worthy to fill the Chair, or in whom he could more rely. We shall have occasion to speak of the Actions of this Prelate, before he was Pope, in the History of the Churches of France during this Century; and of what he did or wrote while he was Pope, in the History of the following Century, to which it belongs, for he was not promoted to St. Peter's Chair till about March, in the Year 999.

An Account of the Roman Writers in the Tenth Century.

After what has been related of the State of the Church of Rome during the tenth Century, and of the Qualifications of those who govern'd it,

Of the Roman Writers in the Tenth Century.

V o L. II.

'tis no wonder that we have so few Monuments of this Church, either of Councils held at Rome, or of Letters written by the Popes.

Of the Roman Writers in the Tenth Century.

S f

John IX.

John IX.

The Letters
of John
IX.

John the Ninth has left us four Letters, and the Acts of two Councils. The first of these Letters is directed to *Harvey*, Archbishop of *Rheims*, who sent to know of him how he should deal with the *Normans*, who, after they had been baptiz'd, had led lives wholly Pagan, and were transported to that degree of Extravagance, as to kill the Christians and Priests, to sacrifice to Idols, and to eat of such things as had been offered in sacrifice to them. *John IX.* after he had congratulated the Archbishop's happiness, in the Conversion of *Normandy*, returns him this Answer, that the persons he mention'd being but newly converted, and not fully instructed in the Christian Religion, ought not to be dealt with according to the rigor of the Canons, but with some sort of gentleness and moderation. That however, if there were any among them, who would submit to all the severities of Penance, he ought to proceed against such according to the Canon. Agreeable to this Letter, *Harvey* sent to *Guy*, Archbishop of *Rouen*, a Memorial containing the institutions of Councils and Popes, the Authorities of the Fathers, and the Example of Saints, concerning the Mercy and Moderation which ought to be exercis'd towards the greatest Sinners upon their sincere conversion and repentance.

Harvey
Archbishop
of Rheims.

John's second Letter is directed to *Stilian* Bishop of *Neocesarea*: He congratulates his steadfastness to the Church of *Rome*, from whose communion nothing was able to separate him, and declares to him, that he hopes that by his Prayers he would prevail upon God to put an end to the Schism, which was of 40 Years continuance. He likewise declares, 'tis his intention that the Decrees of his Predecessors against *Pactus* and his Adherents, should continue in their full force, and exhorts him not to act contrary to them.

The third Letter of *John* is directed to the Clergy and Laity of *Langres* in *France*, who had petitioned his Authority for re-establishing of *Argrin*, their Bishop, who had been turn'd out of his Bishoprick by the Sentence of *Stephen* the Predecessor of Pope *John*. He being well informed that this Bishop had been elected canonically, that he was turn'd out upon false grounds, and that there had been never another put in his place, re-establishes him by this Letter, notwithstanding the decree of *Stephen*, wherein he tells them, "That he did not revoke what was done, but that he altered it for the better, for the benefit of the Church, and out of pure necessity, as his Predecessors had done upon several occasions. He wrote the very same Words at that time to *Charles* the Simple, and prays him to re-invest *Argrin* in his Bishoprick, which is his fourth Letter. We have two Letters likewise of Pope *Benedict IV.* on the same subject, wherein writing to the Bishops of *France*, to the Clergy and Bishop of *Langres*, he confirm'd the sentence of his Predecessor in favour of *Argrin*, and very earnestly presses for his Restitution.

The Letters
of Benedict
IV.

The Letter
of Hatto
Archbishop
of Mayence
to John
IX.

We have likewise two Letters of the Bishops of *Germany* directed to this Pope. The first is writ in the name of *Hatto*, Archbishop of *Mayence*, and his Suffragans. After protestation made, that there were no Churches more submissive to the Holy See than *Theirs*, nor any Bishops paid greater deference to it than they did, they acquaint him that the Emperor *Arnulphus* being dead, his Son *Lewis* had been elected in his place, by the Advice of the Princes, and with the consent of the People, according to the Ancient custom of continuing the Kings of *France* always in the same Line. They told the Pope, that the reason why they did it without his permission, was, because all the Passes that open'd from *Germany* to *Italy*, were in the possession of the *Barbarians*, so that they could not send Deputies to *Rome*, nor could the Pope send his Legates to them: That having at last found an opportunity of conveying this Letter to his hands, they pray'd him to confirm by his Benediction the choice which they had made. After this they inform'd him of the Complaints which the Bishops of *Bavaria* made, upon the account that the *Slavonians*, who had possess'd themselves of *Moravia*, and were declar'd Rebels against the *French*, pretended that they were out of their Jurisdiction, and would have a distinct Metropolitan of their own; and they accus'd the *Bavarians* of entering into Alliance with the Pagans, and partaking of the disorders which they committed. They assur'd the Pope, that this accusation was a malicious calumny, and gave him to understand, that if he should grant the *Moravians* a Metropolitan, and permit them to withdraw themselves from the Jurisdiction of the Bishops of *Bavaria*, he would be the cause of great disorders; for this would give them an occasion of rising against the powers to which they ought to be subject, and of making a new War with them. They added, that they gave him this caution with so much the more freedom, because they thought themselves oblig'd to inform him, when ever any thing happen'd to the Church

of *Rome* which deserv'd correction, that so some speedy and necessary Remedy might be apply'd thereto.

The Letter of *Theotmarus*, Metropolitan of *Bavaria*, and of the other Bishops of that Province upon the same subject is as strong. 'Tis written not only in the name of the Bishop, but also in the name of the Clergy and people of *Bavaria*. They remonstrated to the Pope, that having learn'd from his Predecessors, and the Holy Fathers of the Church, that the Bishop of *Rome*, had always taken care to maintain the Peace, Union, and Discipline of each Church, they could not tell how to believe what they had notice of every day, that there was issued out of the Apostolical See (the Origine of the Christian Religion, and the source of their sacerdotal Dignity) a Decree unjust, and contrary to the Doctrine and Authority of the Church: But that an Archbishop called *John*, and two Bishops who gave out that they were sent by the Pope to the *Moravians*, had given occasion for this Report. That these People were formerly Dependants on their Prince, and on their Bishops, who had converted them: That the Bishop of *Passaw* had always liberty of entering among them, and of holding Synods there, till such time as they rose up in Arms, and renounc'd Christianity. That of late indeed they boasted that they for a Sum of Money had prevail'd upon the Pope to send three Bishops, who, in the Bishoprick of *Passaw* had undertaken such a thing, as they could not believe proceeded from the Holy Apostolical See, being so directly contrary to the Intention of the Canons; namely, to canton that Bishoprick into five parts, and to place an Archbishop and three Bishops into that Diocese, without the consent of the Archbishop and Bishop. They cited two Canons of *Africa*, and several passages out of the Letters of Pope *Leo* and *Celestine*, wherein this very thing was prohibited. They add, that his Predecessor had consecrated *Wichinus* Bishop, at the instance of the Duke of *Zutphen*, but withal, had sent him not in to the Dutchy of *Passaw*, but into a Conquer'd Country. They likewise complain'd, that his Legates giving credit to the Stories of the *Slavonians*, accus'd them of several falsities. They likewise took notice that their Prince was descended from the House of the King of *France*, who were Christians, whereas the *Moravians* and *Slavonians* were originally Pagans and Enemies to the Christian Religion. They prais'd their King *Lewis*, and observ'd how zealous he was for Religion and the Holy Sec. They refuted the Reports which the *Slavonians* had rais'd of their entering into a prophane Alliance with the *Huns*, and of their supplying them with Money to go into *Italy*. They said that the *Slavonians* were the Persons who were in confederacy with the *Huns*, when they pillag'd, burnt, and ravag'd all before them. That for their parts, they design'd to have oppos'd their entering *Italy*, and to have march'd to the Assistance of *Lombardy*; and that they might be in a condition to do it, they desired a Cessation of Arms from the *Slavonians*, but could not obtain it. They concluded by conjuring the Pope not to give credit to the calumnies which the *Slavonians* cast upon them, nor suffer such a division in their Church.

The Letters
of John
IX.

The Letter
of the Bi-
shops of Ba-
varia to
John IX.

One of the two Councils held under *John IX.* conven'd at *Rome*, and the other at *Ravenna*. The Institutions of the former are divided into twelve Articles.

The first condemns the Proceedings of the Synods held under *Stephen VI.* against the Body of *Formosus*, which they had dug out of his Grave, cited and judg'd in a full Synod, which was an Action without all Precedent. In this Article is forbidden all such Usage for the Future, because a dead Body cannot be cited into a Court of Judicature, since 'tis impossible he should answer the Accusations laid to his Charge.

The second grants a full Pardon to the Bishops, Priests, and other Clergymen, who out of Fear of being ill treated themselves, assisted at that: And orders that for the Future no such Constraints shall be used, but that the Bishops when they convene shall be left to a perfect Liberty and Freedom.

The third imports, that since *Formosus* had been translated from the Bishoprick of *Oporto* to that of *Rome*, purely out of Necessity, no Person could make it a Precedent for the Future, and it shall not be allow'd to promote any Person to any higher Degree of Dignity, who has been declar'd to have forfeited an inferior Order, unless he has been re-establish'd canonically; as the People had done in advancing *Boniface I.* who had been depos'd from the Subdeaconship and afterwards from Priest's Orders.

The fourth restores those Clerks to their Orders, who were ordain'd by Pope *Formosus*, and had been depos'd in a Passion.

The fifth renews the Canon of the *African* Council against Re-ordinations, Re-baptizations, and Translations; and

and prohibits the ordinary Bishops in those Churches, which were provided with Bishops, unless those who were in Possession had been depos'd according to the Canon.

The sixth confirms the Consecration of *Lambert* for Emperor, and condemns that of *Berenger*.

The seventh condemns the Acts of the Council of *Rome* against *Formosus*, to be burnt.

The eighth declares *Sergius*, *Benedict*, and *Marinus* Priests; and *Leo*, *Pascal*, and *John* Deacons, to be lawfully condemn'd and separated from the Church, and anathematizes those who should acknowledge them as Clergymen, or should endeavour to re-establish them.

The ninth excommunicates the Persons, who had dug up the Body of *Formosus*, and cast it into the *Tiber*.

The tenth, for the Prevention of those Violences, and that Scandal which sometimes happen'd in the Election of Popes, ordains that for the future, none should be made, but what were elected by an Assembly of the Bishops and Clergy, in Pursuance to the Desires of the Senate and People, and in the Presence of the Emperor. This Canon likewise forbids the exacting of unreasonable Oaths and Promises.

The eleventh is levell'd against an Abuse very prevalent at that Time, of robbing the Pope after his Decease, not only of his Patriarchal Seat, but of all others which belong'd to him in *Rome*, or thereabouts.

The twelfth was against another Abuse which prevail'd at *Rome*. The secular Judges apprehended such Women as were suspected to be bad Livers, and by the Severity which they us'd to them, oblig'd their Masters or their Relations to redeem them at a dear Price: and afterwards those who had redeem'd them, whether Clerks, or Laicks, thought they might freely enjoy them without the Fear of a Reprimand, since the publick Centure was pass'd upon them; which was the Cause of a very great Disorder. The Council to put a Stop thereto, granted the taking Cognisance of and passing Judgment on these Offences to the Bishops, with a Power of citing the Refractory before the Civil Magistrates.

Some Time after, the Pope being come to the Emperor *Lambert* at *Ravenna*, they there conven'd a Council of 74

Bishops, who confirm'd what had been done in the Council of *Rome*, and approv'd of the ten following Institutions.

By the first it is ordain'd, that the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and what is contain'd in the Registers of *Charles* and his Successors, concerning *Tenets*, should be observed.

Afterwards the Emperor propos'd two Articles. By the first, all Persons whatsoever are forbidden to arrest, or offer any Injury to those who should make their Appeals to his Imperial Majesty.

By the second, the Emperor confirms the ancient Privileges granted or confirm'd by his Predecessors to the Church of *Rome*.

The pope afterwards propos'd the following Articles.

First, A Confirmation of what was enacted in the Council of *Rome*, in Favour of *Formosus*.

Secondly, The punishing of the Outrages committed on the Territories of the Church of *Rome*, which had oblig'd him to have recourse to the Emperor.

Thirdly, A Renewing of the Treaty made between the Holy See and the Emperor *Guy*, *Lambert's* Father:

Fourthly, That the Edicts which were not conformable to the Conditions of this Treaty should be repeal'd.

Fifthly, That the Estates granted by the Letters Patents of the Prince, to the Prejudice of that same Treaty, should be restored to the Church.

Sixthly, That the Emperor shall break off the Leagues which the *Romans*, the *Lombards*, and the *French* had made together, contrary to the Interests of the Holy See and the Empire.

Lastly, That the Emperor shall protect the Church of *Rome*, prevent its being disturb'd, and use his utmost Care to restore to it its ordinary Revenues, which were now wasted.

These Articles being approv'd by the Bishops, the Pope recommended to them the Appointing a Fast and solemn Litanies upon their Return to their Respective Diocesses.

[The four Letters of Pope *John IX.* and his Acts of the two Councils are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 483.*]

John X.

WE have three Letters of *John X.* which relate to the Affairs of *France*. The two first are about the Affair of *Hilduin*, whom *Charles the Simple* had turn'd out of the Bishoprick of *Liege*. This

Hilduin being supported by *Giselbert*, who held Part of *Lorraine* against *Charles the Simple*, and by *Henry the Fowler*, King of *Germany*, was ordain'd Bishop of *Tongres*, or *Liege*, by *Herman* Archbishop of *Cologne*, plac'd into the Possession thereof, and ris'd the Effects of it. *Charles the Simple* nominated *Richerus* to this Bishoprick, and caus'd him to be elected by a Party of the Clergy and Laity of *Liege*, who were come to him to complain of the Extravagances of *Hilduin*. This Prince thereupon wrote a Letter to all the Bishops of his Kingdom, wherein he made it appear by the Registers and Canons, that *Hilduin* was not fit to be a Bishop, 1. Because he was a Rebel and Traitor against his Prince. 2. Because he procur'd himself to be ordain'd by Faction and Violence. 3. Because he ris'd the Treasures of the Church of *Liege*, to bestow on those who were the Instruments of his Ordination. 4. Because he had pretended that the King had conferr'd on him the Bishoprick of *Liege*. 5. Because being cited thrice by *Herman*, to make his Appearance before the Synod, he had not complied therewith. After this Remonstrance, *Charles* exhorts the Bishops of his Kingdom to joyn with him, in turning this Usurper out of the Bishoprick of *Liege*.

'Tis very probable that he wrote likewise to Pope *John X.* upon this very Subject, and that this gave Occasion to that Pope to write to *Herman*, citing him, and *Hilduin*, and *Richerus* to come to *Rome*, that he might decide this Difference; of which he inform'd *Charles the Simple* in another Letter. The two Competitors obey'd, and came both to *Rome*, where the Cause was decided in Favour of *Richerus*, who was ordain'd Bishop of *Liege* by the Pope, and *Hilduin* was excommunicated. This contest began in the Year 920, and ended in the Year 922.

The third Letter of Pope *John X.* is directed to the Bishops of the upper *Narbonnois*. The Church of *Narbonne* which was the Metropolis of that Country, being vacant, *Agins* had been elected into it according to the Canon; but a powerful Man named *Gerard*, possess'd himself of that Archbishoprick, having counterfeited Letters from the Pope. *John X.* disowns them in this Letter, and declares that he would not give him a Grant thereof when he came to *Rome*, tho' he was ignorant of his Treachery and Knavery; but that being since fully inform'd of the Matter, he orders them not to acknowledge him any longer for Bishop, since he had been neither elected by the Clergy and Laity of that Town, nor ordain'd by the Bishops of the Province. By the same Letter he sends the Pall to *Agins*. [These three Letters of *John X.* are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 574.*]

Leo VII.

WE have likewise three Letters remaining of *Leo VII.*

The first is directed to *Hugh*, Duke of *France*, and Abbot of *St. Martin* of *Tours*. He therein enjoyns him, under the Pain of Excommunication, not to suffer any Women to stay, or so much as enter within the Inclosure of that Monastery.

The second is directed to *Gerard*, Archbishop of *Lorch* in *Germany*. He grants him the Pall, and permits him to make use of it, not only on the Days of consecrating the Holy Chrism, and of the Resurrection of our Lord, but also on the Festivals of *Christmas*, of the Blessed Virgin, of the Apostles, of *St. John* the Baptist, of *St. Lawrence*, of *St. Stephen*, and of all those Saints whose Bodies lay interr'd in his Church, and on the Day of his own Consecration, and of the Dedication of the Church; during the Consecration of the Bishops and Priests, and the Sermons to the new Converts. He exhorts him to behave himself so, as that the Sanctity of his Morals may be suitable to the Dignity

of that Ornament, and afterwards makes a very edifying moral Discourse upon that Subject.

This *Gerard* came afterwards to *Rome*, and consulted with the Pope about several Questions, to which he gave an Answer directed to the Bishops of *France* and *Germany*. The first of these Questions is concerning Necromancers, Magicians, and Wizards, whether they ought to be admitted to Penitence: The Pope reply'd, That the Bishops ought to bring them over to Repentance by their Exhortations, that so they might live like Penitents, rather than dye like Criminals. He adds, that if they slighted the Censures of the Bishops, they ought to be punished according to the Rigor of the Civil Laws. The second Question is, Whether the Bishops ought to say *Pax Vobis*, or *Dominus Vobiscum*. The Pope reply'd, That they ought to act conformably to the Custom of the Church of *Rome*, wherein *Pax vobis* was said on *Sundays*, the principal Festivals, and on the Festivals of the Saints, on which Days they likewise said *Gloria in excelsis*; and that *Dominus vobiscum* was us'd in the Time

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

of Lent, the Ember-Weeks, the Vigil of Saints, and on Fast-days. The third Question is, to know whether the Lord's Prayer ought to be said at the Benediction of the Table. The Pope reply'd, No, because the Apostles recited it at the Consecration of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. The fourth is, Whether a Man might marry with his God-mother, or God-daughter: The Pope reply'd, That such Marriages were forbidden. The fifth has respect to those Priests who marry publicly: The Pope orders, that they shall be depriv'd of their Dignity, but that their Children should not be endamaged thereby. The sixth is, Whether Suffragan Bishops can consecrate Churches, ordain Priests, or confirm: The Pope prohibits it, according to the tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*. The seventh is, concerning those who marry their Relations without

knowing it, and who afterwards upon the Knowledge thereof, confess it to the Priest: The Pope orders, that they shall be parted and enjoyn'd Penance. The last is, concerning those who rob Churches: The Pope declares, that the Bishops ought to proceed against them with all the Authority God has put into their Hands. At the End of this Letter he adds, that he constituted *Gerard* his Vicar in Germany; and exhorts the Bishops to joyn with him in reforming those Abuses, which the Incursions of the Pagans, and the Persecution rais'd by false Christians had introduc'd.

These Letters of *Leo* are written in a pretty good Style, and full of good Maxims, and confirm the Judgment which *Flodoard* had pass'd upon him, that he was a great Servant of God. [His Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 594.*]

Agapetus II.

Agapetus II.

WE have likewise a Letter of Pope *Agapetus II.* wherein he adjusts the Difference which was then on foot between the Church of *Lorch* and that of *Salzburg*, concerning the Right of Metropolitanship, by giving the Priority to the Archbishop of *Lorch*, whose See was the most ancient Metropolitan, together with a Jurisdiction over the *Eastern Pannonia*, and over the Coun-

try of *Avurois*, of the *Moravians* and *Sclavonians*, and by granting to the Archbishop of *Salzburg*, whose See was rais'd to an Archbishoprick by *Leo III.* the Right over the *Western Pannonia*.

There is another Letter of this Pope, which is a Privilege in Favour of the Abby of *Cluny*. [Both these Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 618.*]

John XII.

John XII.

WE have two Letters of *John XII.* One, by which he grants the Pall, to *Dunstan*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*: and the other, whereby he excommunicates *Iffuard*

and his Adherents, who had seiz'd upon the Lands and Estates belonging to the Abby of *St. Simplicien* in *Provence*. [These Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 641.*]

John XIII.

John XIII.

There are four Letters of *John XIII.* The first is directed to the Bishops of *Bretagne*, whom he exhorts to acknowledge the Archbishop of *Tours* for their Metropolitan. The second is directed to *Edgar* King of *England*, wherein he promises him to turn out of the Church of *Winchester*, such Prebendaries as lead a scan-

dalous Life, and to put some Monks into their Places. The third and fourth are two Privileges which he grants, one to the Monastery built by *Berenger* Bishop of *Verdun*, the other to the Monastery of *St. Remy* of *Rheims*. [These four Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 663.*]

Benedict VII.

Benedict VII.

Pope *Benedict VII.* by his Letter to the Bishops of *France* and *Germany*, confirms the Arbitration made in Favour of the Church of *Lorch* by his Predecessor *Agapetus*, and sends the Pall to *Pilgrin*, who was Archbishop of the Place. [This Letter is extant *Concil. Tom. 9.*

p. 718. It was first publish'd by *Lambeck*, *Com. Lib. 2. c. 8. p. 645.* who likewise gives us a Diploma of this *Benedict*, concerning the Privileges of the Monastery of *Gembours*, *Anno Dom. 983.* which is to be met with in *Lambeck's Book p. 901.*]

John XV.

John XV.

They give the Title of the Letters of *John XV.* to a Treaty of Peace between *Etheldred* King of the *West Saxons*, and *Richard* Duke of *Normandy*; to a Monitory which this Pope sent to *Arnold* and *Baldwin*, Counts of *Flanders*, admonishing them to make

Restitution of the Revenues belonging to the Abby of *St. Riquier*; and to another such like Monitory sent to the Bishops of *Picardy*, exhorting them to procure the said Restitution to be made. [These three Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 731.*]

Gregory V.

Gregory V.

Gregory V. restor'd to *John* Archbishop of *Ravenna*, the Church of *Placentia*, which had been rais'd by his Predecessor to an Archbishoprick, and put that of *Monferrat* under its Jurisdiction: This is the Subject of the first Letter of this Pope.

By the second he grants the Pall to *Gerbert*, Archbishop of *Ravenna*, and confirms and grants several Privileges to that Church.

The third Letter of this Pope is, a Privilege which he grants to the Abby of *St. Ambrose* of *Milan*.

The fourth is directed to Queen *Constantia*, the Wife of *Robert* King of *France*, whom he exhorts to punish those who had pillag'd and burnt the Demeans of a Bishop of *France* called *Julian*. [These four Letters are extant *Concil. Tom. 9. p. 752.* *Balsinus* publish'd another Letter of his, concerning the Privileges of the Abbots of *Mons major*.]

This is all we have remaining of the Writings of the Popes, which were in Possession of the Holy See during the Tenth Century.

Ratherius Bishop of Verona.

Ratherius Bishop of Verona.

Among the famous Men who flourish'd in *Italy* during this Century, none was of greater Repute than *Ratherius*, Bishop of *Verona*. His Life has something in it extraordinary, upon the Account of the many cross Accidents which he met with. He was a Monk in the Abby of *Lobbes*, where he grew into great Esteem for his Learning. Happy had he been, had he stay'd quietly in that peaceable Harbour, and not expos'd himself, as he did, to the Waves of a tempestuous World. But whether he was called to another Post because of his Abilities, or whether he had some other Motive to incline him to it, he follow'd the Fortune of that *Hilduin*, who had

usurp'd the Bishoprick of *Liege*, and was afterwards turn'd out of it. *Hilduin* retir'd into *Italy*, and after the Death of *Notger*, Bishop of *Verona*, he was put into the Possession of that Bishoprick by King *Hugh*, who promis'd to advance him to a more considerable See when Occasion should offer, and then to bestow that of *Verona* on *Ratherius*. A while after that Prince having determin'd to translate *Hilduin* to *Milan*, sent *Ratherius* to *Rome*, to procure Pope *John XI.* to approve of this Translation. Whilst *Ratherius* was upon this Negotiation at *Rome*, King *Hugh* alter'd his Mind, and design'd to bestow the Archbishoprick of *Milan* upon some other Person. However, *Ratherius* brought a Letter from *Rome*.

Of the Church of Rome, and other Italian Churches, during the Tenth Century.

Rome, whereby the Pope approv'd of the Instalment of *Hil-duin*, in the Archbishoprick of *Milan*, and granted him the Pall; and another Letter, whereby he requir'd in his own Name, and in the Name of the Church of *Rome*, that *Ratherius* should be made Bishop of *Verona*. This displeas'd King *Hugh*, who had other Designs in his Head; however, he could not tell how to deny the Requests of the Holy See, and of the Lords that were about him. He was the more inclin'd to grant it, because *Ratherius* being then sick, he believ'd he would quickly march off to the other World. But he recover'd of his Distemper, and was ordain'd Bishop in the year 931. *Hugh* being very much enrag'd against him, swore that he should be never the better for his Ordination, and would oblige him to be contented with only a Part of the Revenue of his Church, and to swear that he would not require any more of it during his Reign and his Son's Reign. *Ratherius* was not willing to submit to such an unreasonable Proposition, whereupon this Prince caus'd him to be persecuted, and sought for Pretences of turning him out. The War of *Arnulphus* furnish'd him with a favourable Opportunity of doing it; for *Arnulphus* becoming Master of *Verona*, *Ratherius* was accus'd of being one of his Party; and when *Hugh* had retaken the Town, he sent him Prisoner to *Pavia*, where he was under Confinement two years and an half. Being releas'd thence, he was oblig'd to go into Exile, where he spent five years, after which he returns into *Italy*, in hopes of being restor'd to his Bishoprick. In his Return he fell into the Hands of *Berenger*, who kept him in Prison three Months and an half by the Advice of *Manasses*: Afterwards he was brought to *Verona*, and receiv'd by *Milo*, Count of that City. He stay'd there two years, under the Government of that Count, who would not allow him any Liberty. In the mean Time *Manasses*, Archbishop of *Arles*, being translated to *Milan*, bethought himself of ordaining a Person for the Church of *Verona*, and some Time after *Ratherius* receiv'd an Order from the Emperor *Lotharius* to withdraw. He did very willingly, he says, in Obedience to that Order, that which he would have done of himself, if he had not been forbidden by the Gospel to relinquish his Flock. He takes no Notice whither he retir'd at this Time, but the Abbot *Fulcuin* tells us, that he stay'd some Time at *Provence* with a Nobleman's Son call'd *Roesling*, that afterwards he return'd to *Lobes*, where he was very kindly receiv'd by *Riquier* who was still living, and that at last he was sent for by the Emperor *Otho*, who plac'd him near the Person of his Brother *Bruno*. This *Bruno* having been made Archbishop of *Cologne*, in the year 953. bestow'd on *Ratherius* the Bishoprick of *Liege*, vacant by the Death of *Farabert*, who had succeeded *Hugh*, the Successor of *Riquier*. But bad Fortune always attended him, for he was oppos'd by a prevailing Party, who turn'd him out two years after, and put up in his Place one *Baudrey*, a Person of Quality in that Country. Spite of these Crosses, he had a Mind to be re-instated in his Bishoprick of *Verona*, and attempted it when *Otho* came into *Italy* a second Time. At first he met with some Difficulty, because the Place was filled by *Milo's* Grandson, whose Ordination had been ratified by the Holy See. However, he insisted upon it, wrote very powerfully to Pope *John XII.* and to the Bishops of *France* and *Germany*, cited them to a Council, and prevailed so far as to be re-establish'd in a Synod held at *Pavia*. But he was no sooner re-enstated in his See, but he had new Controversies between himself and his Clergy, so that he took up a Resolution to retire. About the year 966. he came into *France*, where he purchas'd Lands, and bought the Abbys of *St. Amand* of *Aumont*, and of *Alne*, in the last of which he dy'd in the year 972.

This Bishop has compos'd several Treatises, a great Part whereof hath been recovered and publish'd by Father *Dachery*, in the second Tome of his *Spicilegium*.

The first has a very fantastical Title: 'Tis intitul'd, *A Treatise of the Perpendiculars of Ratherius Bishop of Verona, or the Vision of a Thief, hang'd among several others*. It is dedicated to *Hubert* Bishop of *Parma*, and he therein reprehends that Slight which the Clergy put upon the Canons. The Work is divided into two Parts. In the first he complains, that he had formerly been turn'd out by the Clergy of his own Church, who could not endure that he should concern himself with the Distribution of the Ecclesiastical Revenues of his own Diocese, tho' it was Part of the Pastor's Duty; and who were not willing he should exercise himself in any other Function, than that of consecrating the Chrism, and of Confirmation. Being harass'd by their continual Rebellion, he undertook in this Writing to shew that their Attempt was a manifest Contempt of the Canons: And for the Proof thereof, he began by collecting those Canons which related to the Authority of Bishops, and which granted to them the Administration of the Goods belonging to their own Churches. Afterwards he made it appear by an Argumentation, that Bishops not being only oblig'd to feed their Flocks spiritually, but also corporally, they had a Right to take Cognizance of the State and Distribution of the Church Revenues, so as to divide them among the Clergy according to Justice and Equity. He shews, that this Equity had

been perverted in the Distribution which was made in the Church of *Verona*; because the most powerful ran away with the greatest Share thereof, and enrich'd themselves at other Mens Costs, and that the Priests and Deacons kept all to themselves, without parting with any to the rest of the Clergy. He adds, that these latter, in whose Behalf he spoke, did not much concern themselves about it, upon two Accounts: First, Because they were very glad they had this Pretence to excuse themselves from doing the Church any Service: Secondly, because they hop'd hereafter to have the same Advantage. Whereas they objected, that the Custom of the Church of *Verona* was quite contrary, he maintains that they ought not to prefer an evil Custom to the Intention of the Canons, and to the Laws of the Church. It was again objected to him, that it was a Reflection upon a Bishop to degrade himself so far, as to distribute amongst the Clergy, and to appoint each their Allowance of Corn, of Wine, and of Money. He reply'd to this, That it was not at all requisite that the Bishop should do this himself, but that he might do it by his Priests and Deacons, if he could find any among them whom he could Trust: Which Way was authoris'd by the Example of the Apostles, who made use of Deacons to distribute the Alms which were collected by their Order; and by the Practice of *St. Sixtus*, who committed the Distribution of the Treasures of the Church to *St. Lawrence*: Upon which he makes this Remark, That *St. Lawrence* speaking to *St. Sixtus*, told him, That he had dispos'd of his Treasures, calling the Treasures of the Church, the Treasures of the Bishops; because the Bishop is, as it were, the Husband of the Church. He proves the same Things out of the Civil Laws, which gave the Bishops a Power of treating about the Privileges of the Church. He afterwards inveighs against that general Contempt, which all Sorts of Christians, from the meanest Laick to the Pope himself, cast upon the Canons and Laws of the Church: And he with a great deal of Heat declaims against the irregular Lives of the Ecclesiastics of his Time, who made no Scruple of violating the Canons openly in Matters of Moment, as well as in small Things. He reproves very smartly, and charges them with several Disorders, which he describes in a plain and naked dress. He speaks against those Persons of Quality, who were mark'd out for Church Preferments, and advanc'd thereto by all Manner of Contrivances, how unfit soever they were for such an Employ: He calls them Thieves, false Shepherds, whose Blessing turn'd to a Curse; Persons excommunicated by the Canons a thousand Times over, who render the Authority of Bishops contemptible, and were the Cause why Men set so slight by their Excommunications and Absolutions.

In the second Part of his Treatise, *Ratherius* more particularly falls upon the Immodesty of the Clergy, which was at such a Height in his Time, that one could scarce (says he) find a Man fit to be ordained a Bishop, or any Bishop fit to ordain others. He takes Notice, that of all the Nations in *Christendom*, the *Italians* were the Persons who had the least Regard for the Canons, and the least Esteem for the Clergy:

[* This is likewise one great Reason of that general Contempt which our modern Clergy labour under; and which will in all succeeding Ages cast a Scorn and a Reproach on all such irregular Clerks of what Church or Nation soever they be.]

* The Reason he gives for it, is, that the Ecclesiastics of their Country were the most irregular in their Conduct, the most immodest in their outward Behaviour, and the most remiss in the Discharge of their Duty. He reckons up several horrible Stories, and charges them chiefly with an infamous Converse with Women. In the Conclusion he gives them to understand, that they had still Place left for Repentance, and earnestly exhorts them thereto. This Work was compos'd by *Ratherius* some Time after he was last re-establish'd in his Bishoprick of *Verona* by the Emperor *Otho*, about the Year 962.

The second Treatise is intitul'd: *A deliberative Determination made at Liege*. He there alledges forty Reasons, why he thought himself oblig'd neither formally nor tacitly to renounce the Government of his Flock, nor to abandon it to those who had robb'd him of it. These Reasons are strong and short, and are of the Nature of *Aphorisms*: In the Conclusion he says, that he formerly made use of them for the Bishoprick of *Liege*; but that the sixteen first were likewise applicable to that of *Verona*. He ends with an Imprecation against those who persist to harass and disturb him. This Work was written at that Time when he solicited his Re-establishment in the Bishoprick of *Verona*.

The third Treatise is intitul'd: *Qualitatis conjectura cujusdam*. He therein exposes under an unknown Name, all that his Enemies laid to his Charge, and how they construed all his Actions in a wrong Sense. 'Tis a continu'd Piece of Raillery one their Spite and Malice; and wrote about the End of his Life, when he had taken up his Resolution to retire: For he therein observes, that it was forty Years ago since he began to aspire to Greatness and Authority, without being ever able to attain it. Lastly, he complains that the Emperor himself had forsaken him.